



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2002

No. 68—Part II

House of Representatives

2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

(Continued)

□ 2030

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we broke for the last vote, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in his wonderful humor put up a chart claiming that the amendment that I have put into the bill to protect men and women in uniform allows us to invade the Netherlands. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has a wonderful sense of humor and I greatly appreciate that. But this is pretty serious business because an International Criminal Court has been created, a court that the United States has chosen not to participate in. We felt it very necessary to pass a bill that is included in this bill, to make sure that not just our men and women in uniform can be arrested anywhere before the world and brought before this court. But there are certain assurances that will happen or authorities that we give the President.

The thing missing from the gentleman's chart is the picture in the middle of the chart of a soldier or a sailor behind bars, being arrested by a court that is totally unaccountable for. This provision that is the core of the bill, by the way, simply gives the President the authority to do whatever is necessary to free our people who get snatched by this rogue court, arrested anywhere in the world, can be tried anywhere in the world, but could be taken to the Hague to appear before the International Criminal Court. That authority could even include an array of options including providing legal assistance.

Now, at the same time it could make clear that should a country arrest and detain an American, we all should ex-

pect that the President would absolutely use the powers at his disposal to free those Americans. Now, if the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is suggesting that the Netherlands, which is our ally, would actually arrest and detain an American, because we continually hear from the ICC supporters that this bill is unnecessary, because there are plenty of protections to ensure Americans will not be held, we would certainly hope that our allies do not intend to arrest our military personnel and try them before the International Criminal Court.

The fact that the ICC is centered at the Hague is irrelevant. Trials could take place in any country that is party to the treaty. But more importantly, this is aimed at countries arresting and transporting Americans. Let us just say, for instance, that Iran, who is a party to the court, or even the al Qaeda, could capture an American soldier and could hold them insisting that they were going to turn them over to the ICC. Now, our language says very clearly and I quote, "bring about the release of any person being detained, imprisoned by or on behalf of or at the request of the ICC."

Is there anyone here who would honestly say we should not do everything in our power to free that soldier? This provision also serves to make it very clear to any rogue nation who might want to arrest an American for political purposes, we will not tolerate it and we will take action to stop it.

Mr. Chairman, that person that is behind bars on that chart could be the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) own constituent. What are you going to do then? What are you going to do for the men and women in uniform? What are you going to do for Members of Congress that could be arrested and brought before the court? What are you going to do for any person that is in the bill, any covered United States person, any covered allied persons or any

individuals detained or imprisoned for official actions taken while the individual was a covered United States citizen or a covered allied person?

This is a very serious provision in the bill. It is serious because it is timely. In one month all of this can proceed. In one month while our soldiers are in Afghanistan, they can be captured and brought before the ICC. In one month any of our soldiers in Bosnia could be captured and brought before the ICC. This is very serious stuff. It is not funny. Let us protect our men and women in uniform and support the provision.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should say at the outset that the provision provided in this legislation by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), I will admit is more thoughtful than the propositions which we usually get from him; but nonetheless, I would like to again correct the record, and I would urge the gentleman to read his own amendment.

I indicated in my remarks that I thought the gentleman may have raised a legitimate concern insofar as U.S. citizens are concerned. But I would point out that his language goes far beyond just protecting U.S. citizens. It says, "The President may use all means necessary to bring about the release of any person," of any person, and it says, "the persons authorized to be freed are not only United States citizens but covered allied persons." And then the legislation goes on to describe who those allied persons are: "Elected or appointed officials or other persons employed by or working on behalf of the government of a NATO member country, a major non-NATO ally, including Australia, Egypt, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Argentina, the Republic of Korea, New Zealand or Taiwan."

Clap, if you please. The gentleman says this does not only apply to the geographical region of the Hague, it applies to any other region of the world

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3013

where one of those allied personnel could be held. I submit to you the large amount of applause from that side of the aisle indicates just how reckless apparently a good many people in this Congress are.

I would suggest, as I did in my earlier remarks, that if you want to deal with this issue in a serious way, you will not, on the basis of a 20-minute debate that took place in the Committee on Appropriations, adopt a multi-page bill which serves as a Gulf of Tonkin Resolution not just to protect our own citizens, but anyone else in the world. It just seems to me that that does indeed make the United States the laughing stock. And I do not think the United States deserves that.

Now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has a perfect right to offer it, and anyone who wants to support it has a perfect right to support it. I personally think that it is a good concern which in its draftsmanship is ill conceived and over-reaches. And if it is indeed to become law, then it needs substantial repair in order to protect the dignity of the United States, and reflect the common sense which usually is supposed to come from this body.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. I am really concerned, I know that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has used that picture, chart, diagram, whatever he referred to it as, to make an interesting observation about this issue. But can you imagine what we would look like if that particular chart showed up on the front page of our friendly newspapers in Europe with our allies or potential allies? I am afraid that it would make us look really bad if a distinguished Member of this Congress was suggesting that another Member was advocating an invasion of an ally. That is what that chart makes it look like. So this is a serious matter, and it deserves serious discussion.

Just a few weeks ago, I had an opportunity to visit with some of our troops in Bosnia. Yes, we are still in Bosnia, and we are still doing things there. And just 2 days before I was with those troops, they had arrested one of the indicted war criminals in Bosnia. They had to use some unusual sources of information. They had to use some very unusual and extreme methods for apprehending this indicted war criminal. They did so.

Now, it was a rather delicate operation. Had they been out there having to worry about doing something that would violate the International Criminal Court or being arrested for something they did, I just wonder how effective their mission might have been. As it was, their mission was very effective.

I will tell another story. We all know about Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan. As part of Operation Anaconda, there were several helicopters with troops. One of the soldiers on board

was a Navy SEAL. He was knocked out of the helicopter as it rose from the ground, and he fell to the ground. The troops in the other helicopter went to the ground and began a fire fight that lasted for nearly 8 hours trying to rescue this Navy SEAL who had been knocked out of the helicopter. They did not know if he was alive or dead at the time, but they were either going to bring him back healthy or they were going to bring back his body. One way or another they were going to bring him back.

They were engaged in a tremendous fire fight with the al Qaeda military unit. One of those Rangers on that helicopter that went in was a Ranger named Mark Anderson. I am glad Mark Anderson did not have to worry about something that might get him arrested by the International Criminal Court.

I am really glad this is not one of the things he had to think about at the time when he was trying to rescue his comrades and save his life. But unfortunately, just several weeks ago my wife and I attended the funeral of Ranger Mark Anderson who lost his life in that incident. I am very happy that Mark did not have to worry about being arrested and being taken to the International Criminal Court while he was performing a mission trying to save a fellow trooper. So I think that this is a serious issue, and I think that we need to be concerned about it. But I do not think we should be giving friend or foe around the world an opportunity to reprint a poster like we just saw here that would indicate that Members of this Congress think that we are going to invade an ally.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the support of our women and men in uniform is indeed a serious matter. I take a back seat to no one in my support of a strong defense and intelligence budget for fighting and winning the wars of the 21st century.

□ 2045

Throughout my tenure in Congress I have voted to ensure that the women and men defending our Nation have the tools and resources necessary to fight and win the next war, not the last one.

During that same time, I have also voted for the tough choices that led to a balanced budget, beginning with the 1993 budget, then Penny-Kasich, and continuing through the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. I voted to put us on a path that led to the first balanced budget in a generation, and I voted with huge bipartisan majorities of this body to create a lockbox and protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

That is why it is so disappointing that we are considering a supplemental appropriations bill that only continues multibillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see. Those deficits break our

repeated promises to protect Social Security and Medicare and they hurt our fragile economy.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better. Sitting down together to hammer out a plan that returns us to a budget surplus is far better than increasing our debt limit by \$750 billion. I am profoundly disappointed that this body is unwilling to make the hard choices necessary to balance the budget and protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. Instead, we are choosing imbalance.

What we need, Mr. Chairman, is a wartime budget that fully funds all that is necessary to win the war on terrorism and puts all other spending and tax issues back on the table to be reprioritized in a balanced budget framework. I support tax cuts that we can afford.

Fiscal responsibility is as much a part of our homeland defense as spending on the war on terrorism. Without economic security, we will never truly have national security. The pending bill fails to reflect this reality. Sadly, it only ensures that future generations will be forced to pick up the pieces left by our unwillingness to make tough but balanced budget decisions. We should do better.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to address the issue of Israel money or some aid to Israel that is in this bill, about \$200 million, and talk about the need for it.

Earlier a speaker said that the economy in Israel is strong, and I would take exception to that. If my colleagues go down to Ben Yehuda marketplace, entertainment area, it is empty. A person cannot go to Bethlehem because the terrorists have it. A person cannot go to the old city of Jerusalem. One can hardly go to the Western Wall without going through more security than it requires to go to the airport.

The hotels are empty or half full. The shopping areas are as well. If one goes to a mall in Israel right now, it is like driving up to the U.S. Capitol; you have to have your car searched; you have to have it turned off; you have to have bomb dogs sniff it; and then when you park in the parking lot at the mall, you go into the mall and there again you have to go through a metal detector. That is life in Israel.

Also life in Israel is a story of a woman at a shoe store who was an employee there and was asked, when a woman walked in one day with what appeared to be a bottle of water, to bend down and pick up a pair of shoes because the customer was interested in it. When the woman bent down, the customer pulled out this water, which was not water after all, but acid, and poured it on her, burning 50 percent of the surface of her body.

It also means, as the case with three teenagers who went to Sbarro's Pizza to get a snack after studying one day, and they went in there and there was a

third young man with him, and he remembered he forgot his wallet and ran out, and when he walked out to get his money, somebody walked in with a guitar case full of explosives and blew up the pizza parlor, killing 16 people, including the two young ladies.

This is a story of a 19-year-old soldier who lived at home, who walked out of her house one day and three minutes later was stabbed just about in her own front yard, stabbed to death, and the terrorist killed three other Israelis in their neighborhood complex before he was captured.

The stories go on and on, and the reason why I mention them is because these statistics are real, and we often look at the statistics, and we hear about Israel and the suicide bombers, but we do not realize there is a lot of other statistics in terrorism that goes on, and these are the numbers just until Tuesday, May 22, that have happened of terrorist attacks in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

We hear about Israel's aggression in the town of Jenin. We hear about their aggression against private citizens. Well, here are some of the weapons which myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) inspected three weeks ago when we were in Israel. These are the weapons that were taken in the town of Jenin from so-called citizens.

Here is the rocket-propelled grenades that were confiscated by the Israeli Army from these so-called private citizens, and notice the Reynolds Wrap around them where they buried them to hide them from inspectors.

The photos go on and on of munitions after munitions, and this is not to mention the 50 tons of ammunition that was on the Carine A, that was a ship, that was confiscated.

Indeed, Israel is our ally. It is the only democracy in the Middle East, and it is surrounded by very hostile neighbors. Arafat is a terrorist. Arafat is not interested in peace. Arafat could end the violence, but he is incapable of bringing the peace on, and should we have an independent Palestinian State, my colleagues have to ask themselves, are we not creating another Iraq or another Iran? Will the axis of evil become four sets of tires on the road of destruction in the world?

It is in America's interest to stand with Israel. They are a great ally. They are a democracy, but also, in order to keep our soldiers from having to go from Central Asia to the Middle East, leaving Afghanistan and going to fight in the Middle East, we need to stand solidly with Israel. We need to give them financial and economic support and military support at this time. I think it is very much appropriate that it is in this bill, and I hope that others will support it.

I also want to say on a sad note, a personal note, many of my colleagues may have already known this, but the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) is not with us tonight. He is a strong supporter of Israel, but his father passed away. So during the course of the next couple of hours if my colleagues find some time and feel compelled, keep the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) in your prayers.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, there are two issues before us today, and on one of them I do not think we will find a hint of dissent. We are at war and we stand united in our support for the President, the war on terrorism and the men and women of our Armed Forces who are fighting valiantly to preserve freedom and democracy.

As a proud member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I have been a passionate advocate for providing whatever support our military needs to win this war and the funding in this bill is critical to meeting that goal. We should have an up-or-down vote on this important issue and we will, but there is another important issue at hand today, Mr. Chairman, and that is the Republicans' attempt to raise the debt limit.

It is this issue that makes today a defining moment for this Congress and this country. Decades from now history will judge us by how we handled the fiscal situation that confronts us right now, and my heart is heavy because I have seen the response of the majority, and this is a travesty.

We should have an up-or-down vote on this important issue of raising the debt limit, but we will not. A year ago the administration claimed there would be no need to increase the statutory ceiling on the public debt until 2008 if the Congress adopted the Republican budget. Last week, Treasury Secretary O'Neill wrote to Congress supporting the very same administration's recent request to raise the debt limit by three quarters of a trillion dollars in order to avoid default on interest payments due by July. These startling developments clearly highlight how responsible the fiscal policy of the administration and the leadership of this House has been.

Last year I joined my Democratic colleagues in cautioning that the administration's budget simply did not add up. Sadly, our warnings were ignored and we were instead continually reassured that we could afford an enormous tax cut, ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, pay down the national debt, fund our domestic priorities and still have a large reserve fund for unanticipated emergencies.

As is now clear to us all, that budget was based on unrealistic surplus projections that never materialized and a misguided tax cut that lavished the vast majority of benefits on the wealthiest Americans.

Not surprisingly, we now face deficits and an ever increasing national debt that stretch far beyond the temporary economic downturn or the costs of the war on terrorism.

Each of us was elected by a majority of the people in our districts to come to our Nation's capital to vote and speak the will of the people. Yet the Republican leadership, in an attack that is becoming all too familiar in this Chamber, has denied an up-or-down vote on an issue that is critical to every one of our constituents.

Let me be perfectly clear on one very important point. Any funds that become available from a debt limit increase come directly from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. There is simply no other money available, and as we pull out the national credit card and say charge it one more time, we are saddling future generations with massive debt and endangering the future fiscal stability of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, when the American people are already paying \$1 billion in interest-only payments on the debt every day, we have a problem. When a debt ceiling of \$5.95 trillion is no longer high enough, we have a problem. When the interest payments on our debt are on a fast track to become our single largest annual expenditure, we have a problem. And when the leadership of this body responds by raising the debt limit by a back door parliamentary maneuver instead of an honest up-or-down vote, we have a problem. That problem is a fiscal policy that does not work and a Republican majority that is willing to dip into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds to make up for a shortfall created by a \$1.8 trillion tax cut pushed through the House last year.

This country will not survive economically if we do not get our fiscal house in order. The crisis is upon us now and the time to respond is now. Are we going to continue to mortgage our children's future or are we going to face this challenge with courage and integrity and put America back on the right track?

It is time to leave behind these secretive, shameful, partisan ploys and honor our commitments. We could do this by working together to craft a bipartisan plan that will responsibly address the debt limit issue while protecting the Social Security and Medicare and ensuring the burdens of today's fiscal policies are not placed on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren.

We need light in this Chamber. As President Woodrow Wilson once said, "Wherever any business affecting the public is conducted, wherever any plans affecting the public are laid, over that place a voice must speak with the divine prerogative of the people's will the words 'let there be light.'"

Mr. Chairman, there is no light in our work today.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we heard some more about spending all the Social Security surplus. I think it is probably prudent that we find out exactly why we are in the situation we are today.

We have a problem with the Democrat leadership in that there has been no budget offered, only criticism. Now there is a body that presides on the north side of the Capitol and one on the south side of the Capitol. The body on the north side of the Capitol is also what some people would call AWOL, absent without leadership.

This rule that we have here is a situation where we have added to the bill section 1403 that provides statutory assurance that the United States Government will take all steps necessary to guarantee the full faith and credit of the Federal Government.

□ 2100

This has been interpreted by the Members on the other side of the aisle that we are going to borrow \$750 billion from the Social Security trust fund. Now, there is nothing in the legislation that says \$750 billion. It is an assumption made from a statement, just like a rumor on a rumor on a rumor. What the rule does do is it creates a mechanism to allow the conference committee to act on the statutory debt.

We have been repaying the publicly held debt over the last 4 years. In fact, we have paid off nearly \$.5 trillion of the nearly \$4 trillion of this debt we have inherited from the Democrats who controlled Congress for the previous 40 years prior to 1995. The Republicans have reduced the public debt. The only growth in government debt was from inner-government debt. This is reflected by the bonds that are held in the Social Security trust fund.

Now, the Republicans have set out on a course for the Federal Government to repay all the debt available for redemption over the next decade. There have been charges that the tax cuts are going to drive us into bankruptcy, but that is not true. There are some long-term bonds that will not mature for several decades, and we cannot get to those and pay them off without paying a premium to redeem them early. But we are still on track to meet this goal even after accounting for the President's tax cut.

Now, the tax cut for fiscal year 2002 is \$38 billion. That is how much money went back to the American public. What they did with that money was one of three things. You have a few options when you have a little extra money in your pocket. One, they could invest it, which is good for the economy, because it allows corporations to expand and create jobs. They can save it, which is good for the economy, because that creates capital for mortgages and people can go out and buy new homes. Or they can spend it, buying goods, which again creates a demand for jobs. All three things are good for the economy. So what we have done this year in tax relief is provide

\$38 billion into the economy, which is helping us come out of the recession.

Now, on September 11, our whole system went into shock, our economy into shock. We started a war against terrorism that is worldwide. We have already provided \$43 billion to address the needs and respond to the crisis that occurred from September 11. Some of it went to New York to help clean up and rebuild the city; some of it has gone to support our young men and women who are now fighting the war on terrorism across the globe, whether it be in Afghanistan or in the Philippines. So this allegation that this bill has \$750 billion worth of debt coming out of the Social Security trust fund is not true. It is a misconception.

Again, let me just refer to section 1403, which is now part of this bill. It says we are going to guarantee the full faith and credit of the government. Now, no one on the other side has really stopped to answer the question what would happen if we do not provide for the full faith and credit of the government. What crisis would then become apparent in our economy? What about those in our districts across the Nation that hold financial instruments from the government, like savings bonds or Treasury bills? What if one of my colleagues' best friends or a relative wanted to cash in a savings bond, and they went to the bank and the bank said, Well, the government does not have full faith and credit, therefore we are not going to honor your financial instrument?

This is a very necessary part of conducting the business of the United States Government. So let us not continue with this facade about spending \$750 billion out of the trust fund for Social Security. This is merely an instrument to make us assure the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again reminds all Members not to make improper references to the Senate.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if things had gone as planned, we might have passed this bill yesterday, passed it overwhelmingly, because we were united in doing what is right for this country. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I was proud of the way we worked together. Members on both sides of the aisle crafted a responsible bill addressing the very real emergency needs of this Nation as we fight a war on terrorism. It includes critical funding for the Pentagon, for airline security, for the economic recovery of New York. It funds our war on terrorism.

Unfortunately, the bipartisan accomplishment was shattered by the Republican leadership's insistence on a backdoor increase in the amount of the debt our Nation can run up. And my colleague who just spoke from the other side of the aisle said it does not say \$750 billion in there. That is because

they do not want to say it, \$750 billion. They do not want to talk about it. My colleagues do not want to talk about what they are doing. They are doing it as something to hide from the American people.

Because of the massive tax cuts for the wealthy, and those are the pockets that that tax cut went into, not into the pockets of middle-class families in this country, the massive tax cuts for the wealthy that the Republicans passed last spring, we are operating again on borrowed money. Increasing our spending limit effectively pays for those tax cuts by raiding the Social Security trust fund. That is where the borrowed money comes from. Further, this gives Republicans a license to continue to do this for years to come.

Put simply, it is like raising the limit on our national credit card and paying for it out of Social Security. Make no mistake, this maneuver has nothing to do with financing our war on terrorism, protecting our Nation, or economic downturn. Only \$800 billion of the \$2.7 trillion increase in our national debt projected by the administration itself is related to any of those needs.

Where does the \$2 trillion of debt come from? That is right, it comes from the Republican tax cut, pure and simple. That is why the administration had been seeking this increase well before September 11, and that is why Republicans refuse to allow a simple up-or-down vote on the issue. They do not want to face the consequences of their tax cut.

This is a raid, pure and simple, on the Social Security trust fund to pay for a fiscally irresponsible plan. Increasing the Nation's spending limit raises interest rates; it amounts to a tax increase on all Americans. It will place the burden on our children for years to come.

You know, this bill is supposed to be about supporting the war effort. It should be about giving our country the tools it needs to defeat terrorism in every corner of the globe. And it is appropriate that we consider this bill on the eve of the holiday during which we honor those who have fought for our country.

We have heard a lot about patriotism on the floor of the House today and impugning people on this side of the aisle and their patriotism. Let me remind the prior speaker and the majority leader and the whip of the Republican Party that on rollcall vote number 103, April 28, 1999, at 8:18 p.m., we had a vote on the floor of this House authorizing the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. That was Serbia and Montenegro. Our planes were in the air, my colleagues, and the people who voted against those troops that night included the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr.

TIHRT). 193 Democrats voted to protect our troops and 192 Republicans voted not to protect our troops. Let us talk about patriotism and put patriotism where it belongs.

Everyone in this Chamber knows that without the extras loaded into this bill, virtually all of us would have supported this bill to help us to win the war on terrorism. I urge the Republican leadership to bring before this House a bill that does not tamper with Social Security. It is a sacred trust between generations.

I have an 89-year-old mother, I have kids who I hope will be working for my Social Security the way I worked for my mother's Social Security. That is what it is about. It is about our values as Americans. It supports our belief that a lifetime of work should guarantee a safe, a secure, and a healthy and dignified retirement. It has nothing to do with this legislation which is about supporting our troops and winning the war on terrorism.

It is time for House Republicans to be straightforward with the American people. The American people are going to hold my Republican colleagues accountable; and it is they, the American people, who will have the final say.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say I rise in very strong support of the DeLay amendment. It is a very serious and necessary amendment that makes clear that the United States will not sit idly by as prosecutors and judges, whose country of origin will be rogue states, bring politically motivated charges against United States servicemen and women around the globe.

I truly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the depiction used by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) of this very serious amendment trivializes not only the amendment but the compelling risk to U.S. peacekeepers abroad, U.S. peacekeepers who are likely to be accused by rogue nations, prosecutors who work for countries like the Sudan, Libya, or other countries where human rights are trashed and cruelty is the order of the day. Our people could be held accountable for doing their duty for either peacekeeping or peace-making. And that, frankly, is absolutely unacceptable.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I was and I am a very strong supporter of the regional criminal actions that have been taken against those who commit crimes against humanity in Rwanda as well as in the former Yugoslavia. I believe we ought to do it on a regional basis, and not allow this ongoing freestanding court with judges and prosecutors, again, who are from rogue states who will sit in judgment of U.S. peacekeepers and peacemakers.

Let me just also say on those regional courts, when the first tribunal was getting under way, I offered the amendments to significantly increase the amount of the U.S. contribution

because of the terrible crimes that were being committed against the Croats and then the Bosnians. So I take a back seat to no one about my concern in holding accountable the Milosevics of this world. But having said that, this tribunal is rife with mischief and is likely to kill peacekeeping as we know it.

Why would we send our men and women out to be held accountable by a Libyan judge and by a Libyan prosecutor who would bring our people to trial? And I would just note parenthetically that the Clinton administration was against this until the last few weeks of the administration when they signed it, but argued against it in Rome as the Rome Statute, or the ICC, was being considered. At one of our hearings I asked the U.S. State Department to go back to all of our wars, World War II, World War I, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, and look at any battle that we were engaged in, and asked the question, Could a prosecutor take the Dresden bombing or the bombing of Japan or Hiroshima or Nagasaki and bring an action against President Truman, or General Marshall, or President Eisenhower, or any of our other generals, or those who flew the Enola Gay? Or take Vietnam or any other conflict, most recently the Persian Gulf, or any conflict we have engaged in.

This is rife, rife with mischief that rogue nations would bring about against us. And let us not forget as well, although it was rejected, there was an attempt to bring action against General Wesley Clark, who led our efforts in the Serbian conflict. And had we had somebody from one of those rogue nations sitting as a prosecutor, he might have been brought to the Hague or there may have been an attempt to bring him to the Hague to stand in account.

Finally, if you want a glimpse about what the ICC will look like when it comes into force, look just at the U.N. Human Rights Convention in Geneva. I have been there, year in and year out, as has the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and many of us saw countries like the Sudan sitting in judgment to do two things: one, they tried to run interference when actions are brought against them; and, secondly, they sit in judgment and then try to give their friends who commit human rights abuses a pass. They constantly do that.

That is why this is a dangerous game. And again I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) owes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) an apology. That little game he played with the Netherlands was way off base. This is a serious amendment, and when our peacekeepers are held accountable, I hope President Bush and any successor President does all that is humanly possible to protect every American service personnel abroad as well as in this country.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say I rise in very strong support of the DeLay amend-

ment. It is a very serious and necessary amendment that makes clear that the United States will not sit idly by as prosecutors and judges, whose country of origin will at times be rogue states, bring politically motivated charges against United States servicemen and women around the globe.

I truly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the depiction used by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) of this very serious amendment trivializes not only the amendment but the compelling risk to U.S. peacekeepers abroad, U.S. peacekeepers who are likely to be accused by rogue nations, prosecutors who work for countries like the Sudan, Libya, or other countries where human rights are trashed and cruelty is the order of the day. Our people could be subjected to kangaroo trials for doing their peacekeeping or peacemaking duty. And that, frankly, is absolutely unacceptable.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I was and I am a very strong supporter of the regional criminal tribunals that have been used to prosecute those who have committed crimes against humanity in Rwanda as well as in the former Yugoslavia. I believe we ought to establish war crimes tribunals on an ad hoc basis, and not allow this freestanding court with judges and prosecutors, who are accountable to none, to sit in judgment of U.S. military personnel.

Let me just say with regards to ad hoc tribunals, that the first tribunal was getting under way, I offered amendments in committee to significantly increase the amount of the U.S. contribution to establish the tribunal. The terrible crimes that were committed against the Croats and then the Bosnians and even the Serbs, demanded no less. So I take a back seat to no one about my concern in holding accountable the Milosevics of this world. But having said that, the tribunal established by the Rome Statute is rife with mischief and is likely to kill peacekeeping as we know it.

Why would we send our men and women out to be harassed and prosecuted by a Libyan judge and by a Libyan prosecutor who would bring our soldiers to trial? And I would just note parenthetically that the Clinton administration was against the ICC until the last few weeks of the administration when they abruptly signed it, but previously had argued against it in Rome, as the ICC was being considered. At one of several hearings I chaired I asked the U.S. State Department representatives to go back to all of our wars: World War II, World War I, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, and look at any battle that we were engaged in, and I asked the question, Could a prosecutor construe the Dresden bombing or the fire bombing of Tokyo or Hiroshima or Nagasaki and bring an action against President Truman, or General MacArthur or Eisenhower or Marshall, or any of our other generals, or those who piloted or crewed the Enola Gay? Or take Vietnam or any other conflict, most recently the Persian Gulf or the bombing of Serbia or any conflict we have engaged in. Were these actions, in whole or in part, war crimes? I got a big "maybe" from State.

The ICC is rife with mischief that rogue nations would bring actions against us. And let us not forget, as well, although it was rejected by the prosecution arm at The Hague, there was an attempt to bring action against General Wesley Clark and others who led our efforts in the Serbian conflict. And had we had somebody from one of those rogue nations

serving as a prosecutor, he might have been brought to The Hague or there may have been an attempt to bring him to The Hague to stand trial.

Finally, if you want a glimpse about what the ICC will look like when it comes into force look just at the U.N. Human Rights Convention in Geneva. I have been there, year in and year out, as has the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and Ms. ROS LEHTINEN, and many of us saw countries like the Sudan sitting on the commission do two things: one, they tried to run interference when actions were brought against them; and, secondly, they sat in judgment and then tried to give their friends who commit human rights abuses, a pass. If given new powers to prosecute Americans—believe me—they will!

That is why this is a dangerous game. I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) owes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) an apology. That little game he played earlier with the Netherlands invasion scenario was way off base. This is a serious amendment, and when our peacekeepers are wrongfully charged, I trust President Bush and any successor President will do all that is humanly possible to protect every American soldier, sailor, or marine abroad.

□ 2115

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I would remind the gentleman that he voted against supporting the troops when they went to Kosovo.

Today this House is sort of engaged in watching a great allegory, only I think the Republican leadership has forgotten one of their famous phrases, "Remember the Alamo." Why do I say that? You ask yourself, why would somebody stand in the Alamo and wait and get killed when they knew they were going to die? Or why did the Jews jump off the rock in Masada? Or why did the troopers get surrounded at Little Big Horn and why did they fight till they died?

The people on the other side, the leadership, are not paying attention to what is going on here, because there is a truth in what is going on in this process, and it is this: You have the power. We can talk and talk and talk and we know that we are going to lose. There is no question about that. We have no illusions that we are going to win. But why do people do what they did in the Alamo? Or why do people fly planes into buildings in New York? Or why do people wrap bombs around themselves? Or why do they go into the general post office in Dublin on Easter Sunday in 1916? You can pick a thousand places in history where people have done what makes no sense to people, where if you look at it you would say, "They had no chance."

We know we have no chance here tonight, but we are frustrated, we are powerless, because you have taken all the power. Wonderful allegory. You come out here, you smash us, you will beat us on every single amendment, and we will not be able to save Social Security, we will not be able to save Medicare. We cannot stop you from

spending like you had no tomorrow. We have no ability to do that. We can tell the American people we stand against that kind of stuff and we will be beaten tonight.

But the problem with that is, we are coming to the last act in the allegory. I got this little thing that came from the GOP to their members:

"Please note that it is mandatory that all Members stay in town and be available for votes tonight and the early morning hours as we plan to finish the supplemental in the early morning hours. It's possible for your boss to catch a late-morning flight home on Friday."

We know martial law is coming. They knew it in the Warsaw ghetto. They knew it everywhere. Did people give up? No. But this really is not the Alamo. It is not really the end. This is more like Dunkirk. The Nazis pushed the Brits all the way up against the beach and they thought, boy, we are going to be in England in about a month. And at Dunkirk they took off 338,000 people who came back to fight another day.

When they surrounded the American troops at Bastogne in the Battle of the Bulge, they sent in an offer of unconditional surrender to General McAuliffe. He sent back one word written on a piece of paper: Nuts.

What you do not understand is there is an election coming and the American people are going to watch what you have done to Social Security and what you have done with the surplus that started out at \$5.6 trillion and you have taken it down below the line and we are down in the depths again, a trillion dollars below. The single biggest reversal in economics in the history of the world. And you guys are still spending. You are still spending. "Let's raise the debt limit. Let's keep spending." It is like if you take your credit card and you give one to your son or daughter and they go to college. They say, "Dad, I've reached the limit. What should I do?" You say, stop spending or get a part-time job or something. But no, not with you guys. You call up the company and say, "Raise our debt limit. We got to have more credit to spend."

We cannot stop you. You are free to do it. But you are also free to pay the price. And do not think this is the last night. I mean, you will win. In about two hours and 40 minutes, you will close this joint down and create a new day and you will come out here and slam bam, thank you, ma'am, and it will be over. We understand that. But do not think it is all over.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will be brief. I just wanted to rise in support of the DeLay amendment.

I broke with my party. I supported sending troops and being involved in Bosnia and in Kosovo. But I will tell those who cared about that, the first American soldier that is brought before the court, we would lose support from

the American public for any involvement around the world. If America is not involved, it is not successful. And if we were not involved, the world would be a much more dangerous place.

The DeLay amendment is really a good amendment. For that I would urge that we would support it.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HERGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the Democrats talk about the debt limit. Here are some points Members and the public should bear in mind when considering these arguments from the other side.

Last week on the same floor during the debate on the Nation's welfare policy, the Democrats offered two proposals: One was a substitute welfare reform bill that called for \$20 billion more in Federal welfare spending over the next five years and \$70 billion more in welfare spending over the next 10 years. The second proposal was a motion to add more than \$11 billion in new spending to the Republican bill. In both cases, the Democrats refused to pay for their additional spending.

Let me repeat this, Mr. Chairman. The Democrats did not pay for their proposed increase in government spending. The additional costs would just get added to our national debt. In contrast, the Republican welfare bill was fully paid for within the House-passed budget. I guess the Democrats have a tough time understanding what that means since for the first time in a generation they did not have their own budget in the House. And the Democrat-controlled Senate cannot seem to get a budget done, either. All of this reflects that what is going on today is a charade. The Democrats can sure talk a good game about fiscal responsibility in general, but when it comes to specific bills that reflect their priorities, like welfare reform last week, being responsible with taxpayers' money is the last thing on their minds.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to stifle the truth. It has a way of coming out. But our friends on the other side of the aisle have tried all day to gag the United States Congress so that we cannot debate the issues and we cannot discuss the truth. But today the truth has leaked out, drip by drip.

The truth is we all support the United States troops. There is no question about that. But the truth also is that we are poised to invade Social Security trust funds for the next 10 years to the tune of \$1.5 trillion through 2012. That is the truth. The truth is the Republican plan is to spend \$2.25 billion in trust funds for other programs in 2003 alone. That is the truth. The truth is our friends on the other side of the aisle should hang their heads in embarrassment. They have been caught in a procedural and political shenanigan that they employed to use American

taxpayer dollars to target and influence specific political campaigns in New York and Pennsylvania. That is the truth. That has nothing to do with our troops. That has nothing to do with national defense. They are funding programs in rural hospitals in New York and Pennsylvania located in vulnerable Republican districts. The rest of America is excluded. That is the truth. There are 1,300 hospitals in this country that will be disadvantaged by this legislation. The only way to make them whole, to put back the money that they are taking away so that they can be returned to current funding levels, is to raid Social Security funds. That is it. That is the truth.

The current bill runs up America's credit card while stealing from America's senior citizens' Social Security. To compound the problem, the Republican plan will require stealing. It will require stealing additional Social Security funds just to keep hospital funding at current levels. You have to do it. You have to take it. There is no other way. That is the truth.

But Republicans do not want Americans to hear this debate. That is what you have been about all day. They stifled the issues. Now they want to stifle the process. They say they want an open debate, but mark my words, Mr. Chairman, within the next few hours the Republicans will stop all debate on the issues. They will stop all debate on the process. They want to gag America. They do not want America to hear the issues. That is an arrogant use of procedural excess and they should be embarrassed.

Mr. Chairman, in Texas we are known for plain speaking. I want to say this to my friends on the other side of the aisle. This comes straight from the Texas Rangers: No party in the wrong can stand up to a party in the right who keeps on a-coming. And, by golly, we are going to keep on a-coming.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I listen to my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I stand before you perplexed by the banter going back and forth. In case you have not noticed, we are at war, folks. I do not know about you, but I want to make sure that the dedicated men and women in uniform, our brothers, sisters, husbands, wives, mothers and fathers, are able to fight and win this war. In order to do that, our troops need the resources to win.

On the eve of this Memorial Day weekend, I think about the beautiful yet harrowing tributes to the hundreds of thousands of fellow Americans that have fought to defend our freedom. The Korean Memorial bears a simple sentence: Freedom is not free. It is one of the simplest and most powerful statements ever made. Freedom is not free. Because war is not free, both in material and, sadly, in human lives.

I have heard the talk about hard choices. There are a lot of choices to

make. But placing the lives of our soldiers at risk over procedural and jurisdictional bickering should not be an option. If we do not supply them with the necessary resources to win, none of the arguments will matter.

These funds will pay for urgent wartime expenses related to the military actions in Afghanistan and other U.S. operations against global terrorist threats. These funds will improve our homeland security by empowering law enforcement with the tools to track down terrorists and safeguard our aviation systems, nuclear assets, ports and borders. I do not like adding to the national debt and I certainly do not like seeing our Nation at war. But these two emergencies, one economic and one military, were forced upon us. Dealing with both of these emergencies in one vote is fine with me.

American troops need the resources to win. I support this supplemental and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we go on to this next debate, I do want to say, and I really hope that some of my friends on the other side will look at their roll-call vote 103 in April of 1999, to stand up here in one day with this President to talk about their feelings for the military. I remember this night clearly. My father was a B-52 tail gunner. He was one who fought in this country. The night of April 28, our Commander in Chief, at the time President Clinton, was sending people into Yugoslavia. And this House, with a majority of Republicans voting against our military, tonight come down and talk about their support of the uniformed men and women. I am not suggesting that they are not, but I would just suggest that we ought to make sure that we are consistent.

I will tell you that I am consistent. I voted that night as I have continued to vote, no matter who was in the Oval Office. But tonight again we are considering a \$29 billion supplemental appropriations bill. All day long we have talked about this. We all know that we are fighting a war on terrorism.

□ 2130

I do not think there is a Member here who does not support that war effort. However, fighting the war on terrorism is only one of many parts of the bill. There are many things that the American people feel that are crucial to their well-being, and we want to respond to all of these issues responsibly. But how are we going to pay for their solution if we continue to spend the money we do not have? You cannot pass the supplemental bill without invading the trust funds and breaking the promises made to the American people.

Instead of paying down the debt, we are adding to the debt and to the interest payments. Before we increase the debt ceiling by another \$750 billion, we need a plan and we need new budget restraints.

You might ask why? Well, you are going to hear from women today about the effects of this bill and the effect they have on women. I think that any family that has tried to plan to send their kids to college, to buy a house, or to perhaps move a loved one out of the workforce to help take care of them, knows they simply cannot call the credit card company and say, "Can you give me an increase in my credit limit?" They do the responsible thing by paying off the family's debt to make room for these expenses.

Families make these decisions every day, and Congress needs to be responsible to the American people as these family members are to one another.

Let us look at how much women, women, your wives, rely on the Social Security program. Let us explore how they would be affected by reductions in benefits due to a \$750 billion increase in the debt limit.

Almost two-thirds of all women 65 years and older get at least half of their income from Social Security. For one-third of these women, Social Security makes up 90 percent or more of their income.

Women take time out of the workforce to care for children and elderly parents. As a result, they rely more heavily on their husband's Social Security benefits. Over 60 percent of women on Social Security receive spousal benefits, while only 1 percent of men receive such payments. Women tend to outlive their husbands by an average of seven years. These seven years can be the most vulnerable times of their lives.

Social Security as we know it today continues to pay benefits as long as the beneficiary is alive. Reductions in Social Security payments due to lack of funds would leave women stranded, so one can see that dipping into Social Security by raising the debt limit can cause great harm, especially to women.

Mr. Chairman, what we are doing here today will have an effect on future generations of families. At this moment Congress is sitting down at the kitchen table figuring things out like so many families do every day. Let us be like those families that pay off their credit card debt to make room for future expenses. Adding \$750 billion in new debt to America's credit card is the wrong way.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I passionately believe that neither party has an exclusive on integrity or ideas or patriotism, but I have to say tonight that the excessive campaign rhetoric of the last 24 hours demeans this process and really falls short of the character of this House.

I want to talk about some of the substantive items in this bill. The International Criminal Court is absolutely a bad idea that Members from both parties should reject every opportunity we get, and the distinguished majority whip should be commended for bringing this amendment forward and trying to

stifle the advancement of the International Criminal Court. It is a great threat to innocent Americans and is a terrible precedent for the future, particularly at this dangerous moment in American history.

Relative to Israel, I do not know what the magic number is. I wish there was a better way of assessing how much they need, and, following the request from Israel, our ally, for what they really need, not using an arbitrary number to establish how much we are sending them. I understand that Secretary Powell and the administration have a delicate balance on trying to negotiate some positive step towards peace, but I do not like funding the PLO or any related organization there at all. I think we need to stand by our ally, Israel, for a host of reasons, most of them Biblical, in my heart, and in no way ever turn away from our ally, Israel, because we will pay the price if we do.

But tonight what we have, after all of the rhetoric is out of the way, is an emergency defense supplemental that is absolutely necessary to get the equipment and the funding in the hands of those men and women who are standing between the threat and our civilian population and the advancement of freedom around the world at a time of terror still and a critical time in world history.

We must move this defense supplemental forward. It is not about tax cuts or Social Security. Those obviously are campaign issues that are coming in the months ahead. Let us push them off to the campaign and let us come together in a bipartisan way and do what is right for the men and women in uniform. That is the bottom line.

We are going into Memorial Day. Last Memorial Day the debate on the House floor was a lot different than this campaign year Memorial Day rhetoric, I promise you that.

When I think of Memorial Day, I think of the greatest generation, the World War II veterans. Every time I honor them, which is every chance I get, they say the real heroes are the ones that did not come back. They are the ones we honor this weekend.

I will tell you how encouraged I have been since September 11, because the greatest generation, we stand on their shoulders and honor them, and they are the greatest. But I wonder about my generation, the generation that has been called the "me generation," the one that was so selfish and so absorbed with our own world that we might not be the "giving generation" or the "great generation" of those that came before us.

But following September 11, the events following September 11, when we saw first responders put their lives on the line and die for others, following that Biblical mantra of the greatest show of love is to give your life for your fellow man, for your friend, in this case people you did not even know,

we, too, have answered this call to courage in our generation.

The greatest generation veterans are smiling with amazement at what this generation is actually made of. We indeed are becoming a great generation ourselves. That is why we owe it to the men and women who are willing to serve our country to give them what they need and to work through these details we are debating today to make sure that we do not delay moving these billions of dollars into defense and homeland security and intelligence capabilities to protect our country and to honor those that are willing to fight and die for us.

Freedom is not free, and as we head into the Memorial Day weekend, let us come together tonight and put aside our differences. Let us meet at the water's edge as Members of the great U.S. House of Representatives and do what is right for America and send the money to those in the field.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, support our troops in the field and our fight against terrorism. Since September 11, in fact, all Americans are united to protect our Nation from terrorism. There is a great unity on this issue.

Those who have fought and given their lives for freedom and our country should not be desecrated by action on this floor in an effort to slip in or by dishonest procedure to raise the national debt ceiling without a debate or an up-and-down vote.

This action affects all citizens, especially our seniors, and especially the widows of our veterans, working families, children and grandchildren. Memorial Day should honor those who have fought to protect our freedom, rather than to cover up other devious action that affects millions of seniors.

Our bipartisan support for the war against terrorism here at home and abroad should not be smeared or compromised by an attack of unpatriotism when we question the adding of unrelated special interest items or controversial items to a much-needed supplemental appropriation to support the war against terrorism.

We desecrate our fallen heroes, and especially their families and their widows, especially women of color. More than 80 percent of the non-married elderly African Americans and Latino women rely solely on Social Security for their retirement income and their daily necessities.

Further, for more than half of the elderly Latino and African American women, it provides 90 percent of their total income. We desecrate our current military men and women when we burden a clean supplemental appropriation to support our military forces with an undemocratic, unprecedented and unfair rule.

This rule was unworthy of our consideration. We can and we should do better. This vague, unclear, deceptive

rule prevents an honest debate, discussion, explanation or a vote on expanding our national debt. However, in the back rooms, not the appropriation rooms, in the back rooms and only by reference in this bill, we will actually send the national debt ceiling up by more than \$750 billion, which will come from, can only come from, Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not should we raise the national debt. We have no choice but to raise the debt. The question is how we raise the debt. The only way we should respond to this is how we can responsibly and accountably do this and govern our country. The question, therefore, is how we respond appropriately without raiding the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, which will affect the widows and the veterans who are so dependent on their daily resources through the payment of Social Security payments.

The uncontrolled, unlimited expansion of our national debt will affect working families by increasing their interest rate for their home payment, automobile payment, student loans and other financial needs.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we add a great burden to our children and our grandchildren to pay for our recklessness and our fiscal irresponsibility.

The big tax cut given last year has caused the greatest need for raising the national debt, more than our need to fight the war against terrorists. Yes, we should be honest. We should be honest with the American people in this debate to tell them that our effort to fight this war on terrorism is costly and will continue to cost. But it is a mistake, in fact an untruth, to suggest that the majority of the reason we have to raise the debt ceiling is for those reasons. It is because we gave such a large tax cut to a few Americans and big corporations that we indeed will have a lack of resources in order to respond to the future needs of millions of older Americans to meet their critical needs.

Mr. Chairman, we need to support the supplemental appropriation for our military men and women. We should do no less. But the way we are doing it does discredit to us, and it certainly does not honor our veterans.

Let us vote on the bill that the Committee on Appropriations sent out and recommended to this floor. In a separate vote we need to debate and vote on the national debt. This is what we should do.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I see that a great many Members are not in the Chamber tonight. I do not know where they are but they ought to be here listening to this debate. But just in case any Members do have a sufficient interest in these issues we are debating tonight want to try to contact someone and tell them to come back, we are giving to talk about some very important amendments.

I have already been here tonight talking about my amendment to reduce the foreign aid section of our bill for Israel and Chairman Arafat, and I have already told you that I will have charts ready for you at the appropriate time to make my point.

□ 2145

And being in lockstep with my leadership for the last 18 years in the House, I know full well when we bring that rule back in a little while, they are going to honor all of my requests and all of the amendments that I have filed are probably going to be in that rule.

In anticipation of that, there is one that some of my colleagues have approached me on because they have taken the effort to read what is going on here. There is one that simply says, "making a lump sum payment to individuals born between 1917 and 1921 or their dependents who are currently receiving Social Security retirement benefits."

Now, I know that many of us have town hall meetings we go to, and I have been having town hall meetings for 18 years. And nearly 99 percent of the time, someone asks me the question, when are you going to fix the notch baby problem? I have always told those people when they came to my town hall meetings, when the opportunity came, I would offer the amendment to make certain they would get their rightful due, their just payment, which they have been denied for all of these years, to stop them from having to be called notch babies.

This does not totally correct it, but it gives recognition to the notch baby problem and does tokenize them with a one-time payment. So I know that all of my colleagues have been to their town hall meetings, and I know, because people tell me, that all of the Members of Congress say they are for correcting the notch baby problem, but nobody ever does anything about it.

Well, when this rule comes back tonight, because of my lockstep allegiance to my leadership, I know full well they are going to make my amendment in order, and when they do make it in order, there is going to be limited debate. So I wanted to let my colleagues know tonight, since I will have a limited amount of time to explain my amendment as it should be explained, that I will only have a few minutes to tell my colleagues what we are doing with this amendment.

So anticipating that this amendment is coming and knowing full well that probably 99 percent of this House has told notch babies in their district that they are going to do something when the opportunity came, I am going to give my colleagues that opportunity tonight so my colleagues can go back home during this Memorial Day recess, have your town hall meetings and tell your notch baby constituents that help is coming because you voted for the Callahan amendment to give them that

recognition and to give them that one-time payment that they so richly deserve.

I know this amendment is going to be in order, or actually I am optimistic that it is going to be in order, because of my lockstep allegiance to my leadership. I have followed them faithfully for 18 years, and surely after all of this period of time, in the last year of my membership in this House of Representatives, they are going to allow me the opportunity to at least introduce the five amendments that I have here. But we are going to have a limited time to debate it, and I wanted all of my colleagues to call their colleagues and tell them to get back over here, that these things are coming up shortly and they better be here to help us correct this problem.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am so glad that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama made himself clear, and I look forward to the notch babies amendment in a bipartisan spirit, because we do have a number of those impacted negatively by that formula, and we do want to be helpful with respect to those seniors. I am glad that there is a positive light on this floor.

But I rise today to be able to confront and to debate issues that, unfortunately, have been under cover. By the way, let me also say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, I would hope to be able to support his notch babies amendment. Unfortunately, I think that if we are going to have peace in the Mideast, we cannot and absolutely should not eliminate the funding to Israel and to the Palestinians, and we must have the kind of aid that says that we are engaged and that we support the peace process. It would be a disaster for the elimination of any funds to the Mideast, Israel or the Palestinians. Certainly, we would not want to undermine humanitarian aid.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) for being the leader on the issue of Social Security and laying the groundwork, while women are now here on the floor of the House, debating this bill in the late night hours, because we realize that those who will be most hurt by the passage of this legislation are clearly going to be the women who are most dependent on Social Security. I used this picture just a few hours ago, it seems like a day ago, because a picture is worth a thousand words or more. I wish it was worth thousands upon thousands of dollars. I wish we could hand out pictures and all of a sudden we get money. But it is important to note that just a year ago we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus and we had not invaded the Social Security trust fund. Today, we stand here with \$400 billion, just a drop in the budget, because our Republican friends have imploded the surplus.

Today I spoke to Randy Rhodes, a talk show host in the great State of Florida. She wanted me to mention that people across the Nation are watching, and they remember in 1993 when not one single Republican stood up and was counted in order to ensure that we have a budget that we could pay our way and begin to build a surplus. Not one single Republican voted. It was the Democrats who sacrificed their majority in order to provide the quality of life for Americans.

Here we go again. In a situation where we thought we had an open rule, where we had the opportunity to debate an issue such as raising the debt ceiling, adding \$750 billion more to our Social Security credit card, as they now claim it to be; and yet we find that, one, we do not have an open rule, and, two, we are going to hide the fact that you are imploding and raising the debt ceiling. You are going to hide the fact that you are raising it to \$750 billion.

What does that do to the women who are impacted by Social Security? First of all, we well know that women of low income, no matter what racial background they come from, depend most on Social Security. We know now that there are grandmothers who are raising children whose sole support is Social Security. At age 65, African American women have a life expectancy of 17 more years, one year longer than white men, while Latina women on the average live to 87, which is longer than either white women or men. In that instance, as it relates to minority women, African American and Latina, Social Security is their main support system, because they usually have had in the past low-wage service and manufacturing jobs. They have had to rely on Social Security.

Go to any one of our districts to our senior citizens homes and find women and ask the question, Do you have enough to live on? Most will say that I have my Social Security. And if I did not have that, I could not pay rent, I could not pay the prescription drugs which I am stretching for anyhow, I could not buy food.

So tonight what we are doing, and I understand we are going to get a midnight rule that is going to shut all of us down, what we are going to do is sneak out of here in the early morning, raise the debt ceiling \$750 billion, and tell those dependent women who depend on Social Security, hey, take a flight, good night, and good-bye; we are using your money tonight.

I would just add another picture. The reason why we do not have any money is because the Republicans have decided to spend 42 percent of any money that we would get on continuing to pay tax cuts to the rich. In fact, we are looking to pay this money up until 2011.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a shame and a sham that we are here tonight doing this disservice to women

who are dependent upon Social Security. Let us vote for the women of America and save Social Security.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we prepare to celebrate Memorial Day and to honor those who fought our Nation's past wars, as well as those who are, as we speak, fighting the war on terrorism in Afghanistan and around the world, we should be thanking these men and women for their courageous service on behalf of our Nation by acting on their behalf; and the best way to thank them is to pass this supplemental appropriations bill.

There are many reasons why we should pass this bill and send it to the President for his signature quickly. First and foremost, we should support this bill because it provides \$7.8 billion for the Department of Defense to pay for the costs of the war, including the salaries of those who are serving, as well as the ongoing cost to train, equip, and prepare them for battle, and to protect the 270,000 soldiers who are serving abroad on this Memorial Day weekend as we debate this bill.

We should support this bill because it also provides \$4.3 billion to pay for the call-up of National Guard and Reserve personnel, the men and women who have put their lives on hold to answer our Nation's call to serve; and there are 85,000 of those on reserve that are now on active duty.

We should also support this bill because it provides \$500 million to purchase high-priority munitions to replace those already used in this war; to buy unmanned aerial vehicles, which have proved their value, and to purchase equipment for our Special Forces on the ground in Afghanistan and elsewhere. We should also support this bill because it provides \$93 million to replace Special Operations helicopters destroyed during Operation Enduring Freedom. We should also support this bill because it provides \$1.5 billion for homeland defense and to strengthen our Nation's intelligence-gathering efforts.

As someone who represents a district in a State that was directly impacted by the tragic events of September 11, we should support this bill because of the additional funding it provides to help rebuild New York City. Members of Congress from New York and New Jersey have worked together to provide our State governments with the necessary resources to rebuild critical transportation and other infrastructure that was destroyed in these attacks. As previous congressional actions have tried to help, and they have, many families have lost loved ones.

Mr. Chairman, we should be standing on this floor tonight united in support of our men and women in uniform, united in support of the war on terrorism, united in our gratitude for those who have served our Nation bravely in the past. Instead, we fight one another.

Let us remember why we are here. Let us pass this bill, let us give each and every one of our men and women in uniform the tools they need to fight and win our Nation's war.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, tonight, it is almost 10 o'clock, and tonight we are reminding our entire country that women in our country really do need to know that by raising the debt ceiling, though sounding very technical, that the debt limit provision in this emergency supplemental appropriations bill will harm Social Security. By putting Social Security at risk, we put women at risk.

This bill will have a devastating impact on women. There are already enormous disparities in income between men and women. These disparities will be much greater if we endanger Social Security. Women rely on Social Security more heavily for a whole variety of economic and social reasons. Poverty among women over 65 is twice as severe as among men in the same age group. Women earn less than men and tend to live longer. Women also lose an average of 14 years of earnings due to time out of the workforce to raise children or to care for an ailing parent. Women are also generally employed more part-time and have less opportunity to save for retirement.

□ 2200

Let me just briefly give some numbers to show how important Social Security is for women.

For unmarried women over 65, including widows, Social Security comprises 51 percent of their total income, a far higher proportion than is true for married couples or men. Seventy-four percent of unmarried elderly women depend on Social Security for at least one-half of their income. Twenty-six percent of unmarried elderly women depend on it as their only source of income.

As stark as these figures are for all women, they are even more pronounced for African American women and Latinas, who are even more dependent on Social Security because they face even greater economic disadvantages throughout their lives.

Clearly, Social Security is the vital safety net for women. This important program lifted 13 million seniors out of poverty last year, and yet, the Republicans in Congress are depleting the Social Security trust fund to pay for the increase in the debt that they are now incurring. They spent the budget surplus by being irresponsible, and now, after using up all of the funds in the Treasury, are really stealing from Social Security and Medicare to pay for their reckless spending. This is just downright wrong.

This is the same Republican leadership that really rammed through, and I remember this very clearly last year, a very punitive bankruptcy bill that will penalize hardworking people who fall

into debt through the loss of a job or an injury. That is an unexpected hardship. This bill is not the result of unexpected hardship, it is the result of a \$2 trillion tax cut for the rich.

We should not raid the Social Security trust fund to pay for a blank check. It will bounce, with the notation "insufficient funds." Women have no way to scramble and make this check good, so they will suffer even more in their golden years, after a lifetime of discrimination and injustice. So our wives, mothers, sisters, grandmothers, daughters, and granddaughters certainly will pay and will pay dearly if we pass this bill tonight.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are a growing number of seniors who are raising grandchildren with their Social Security income. That is a group that we do not often talk about.

Just a couple of weeks ago in this House when we dealt with TANF and welfare reform, these grandmothers and grandfathers raising their grandchildren were left out of the process. There were no additional dollars set forth to assist them in that effort.

That is why it is so difficult as we stand here to talk about this piece of legislation that is before the House this evening, that we would not consider that significant group of people who not only are raising grandchildren, they are required to pay for prescription drugs. Then, in addition to that, they may have to worry about where their next check comes from.

A second group that is often not discussed when we talk about Social Security are those who are beneficiaries of the Supplemental Security Income, those who are disabled for one reason or another, who are often left out of that process. I guarantee Members there are many women involved.

Lastly, I would say that tonight, if we want to raise the debt ceiling limit, let us step up and vote specifically for it and not cloud it in this legislation.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, normally I do not get up and say much about this, but I sit here tonight and I hear all this about Social Security and how we are raiding the trust fund. We are not doing that. We are trying to scare our seniors. The seniors' Social Security money is going to be there. We are not doing anything to take their money away from them.

This bill is about a war that is going on. This bill is about helping our military men and women who are out there on the front lines right now, and we are sitting here doing scare tactics, demagoguing. I am not sure what we are doing on this floor tonight. I sit here and listen to all of this, and I do not quite understand it.

We are not raiding the Social Security trust fund, we are just trying to help our men and women who are out there fighting for us. I just do not understand why we are sitting here arguing like this about something that is not happening. This is about giving the President and giving our men and women in the military the dollars that they need to fight our war on terrorism.

We are not taking dollars away from our seniors, and I think it is shameful, absolutely shameful, that Members are trying to scare them.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINCHEY:

In section 1404, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) RECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN NEW YORK COUNTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2002, and before October 1, 2005, for purposes of making payments under subsection (d) of section 1886 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww) to hospitals in Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties, New York, such counties are deemed to be located in the large urban area of New York, New York.

(2) RULES.—The reclassifications made under paragraph (1) shall be treated as a decision of the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board under paragraph (1) of such section 1886(d).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. It seeks to amend language previously agreed to. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HINCHEY. I wish to be heard on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's question is, does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. HINCHEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized to speak directly on the point of order.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I am offering has to do with section 1404, and it strikes subsection (b). Subsection (b) of the legislation, the bill that is before us, deals with the counties of Orange and Dutchess in New York.

This amendment deems that these two counties are eligible for reimbursement under Medicare as if they were located in the metropolitan area of New York City. The effect of the language in the present bill would be to provide more funds to the hospitals in those two counties, Orange and Dutchess, but it would do so at the expense of hospitals in Putnam, in Westchester, in Rockland, and in the five boroughs of New York City itself.

That would be a disservice to those counties adversely affected, so the amendment that I am offering would provide that the hospitals located in

Orange, Dutchess, and Ulster counties would be deemed eligible for Medicare reimbursements as if they were located in the metropolitan area of New York City, but it will do so in a way that does not adversely affect the reimbursement rates for the hospitals of Westchester, Putnam, Rockland, or the five counties of the city of New York.

So the amendment that I am offering is much fairer, much more equitable, and does not disadvantage those counties that I have mentioned.

Why do we need to do this? We need to have amendments like this because of the fact that hospitals all across this country are adversely affected by the budget that was passed by this Congress earlier this year, and particularly by the tax cut which was put into effect by this Congress early last year.

The effect of that \$1.3 trillion tax cut not only has jeopardized our Social Security system, but is making it clear that as we move forward over the course of the next seven, eight, or nine years, more and more money will be taken out of the Social Security trust fund as a result of the tax cut which was forced through this House of Representatives early last year by the majority party.

Not only will that happen, but also as a result of that tax cut, less money is available for Medicare reimbursement. So not only have we placed in jeopardy the Social Security of our senior citizens, but we have also placed in jeopardy the health care of our senior citizens by that tax cut, as well.

So we see clearly the adverse effects of the \$1.3 trillion tax cut, the majority of the benefits of which went to a tiny fraction of the wealthiest people in the country. In order to provide that benefit for the wealthiest people of this country, we are taking money out of the Social Security trust fund and we are also taking money out of the Medicare trust fund, so that our hospitals are disadvantaged in providing health care, not only for senior citizens, but essentially for everyone else who has recourse to use those hospitals.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses the problem that has befallen hospitals across this country, and particularly those that are mentioned in the amendment, the adverse effect that has been visited upon these hospitals as a result of the \$1.3 trillion Republican tax cut, the majority benefits of which went to the wealthiest people in the country.

This amendment does so, helps those hospitals in those counties, without taking money from the hospitals in the adjacent counties of Putnam, Westchester, and Rockland and the five boroughs of New York City, as is done by the language in the bill that is before us. That is why this amendment is a great improvement over the language that exists in the instant bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is ready to rule.

As indicated in the ruling on the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) earlier today, the amendment proposes to change text previously inserted by amendment adopted pursuant to H. Res. 428, so the point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) was sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); another amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 213, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—199

Abercrombie	Capuano	Engel
Ackerman	Cardin	Eshoo
Allen	Carson (IN)	Etheridge
Andrews	Carson (OK)	Evans
Baca	Clay	Farr
Baird	Clayton	Fattah
Baldacci	Clement	Filner
Baldwin	Clyburn	Ford
Barcia	Conyers	Frank
Barrett	Costello	Frost
Becerra	Coyne	Gephardt
Bentsen	Cramer	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cummings	Gordon
Berman	Davis (CA)	Green (TX)
Berry	Davis (FL)	Hall (OH)
Bishop	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Blagojevich	DeFazio	Harman
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Delahunt	Hill
Boswell	DeLauro	Hilliard
Boucher	Dicks	Hinchee
Boyd	Dingell	Hoeffel
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Holden
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Holt
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Honda
Capps	Edwards	Hooley

Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)

NOT VOTING—22

Bonior
Burton
Combest
Condit
Crowley
Deutsch
Granger
Gutierrez

Hinojosa
Langevin
Linder
Lipinski
Lynch
McIntyre
Radanovich
Riley

Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Roukema
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Traffant
Vitter
Wexler

□ 2248

Mr. LANTOS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 225, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin

Carson (IN)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner

Flake
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof

Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kieczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pitts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez

NOES—225

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Coble
Collins
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint

Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Saxton
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sessions
Shadergg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus

NOT VOTING—18

Bonior
Burton
Combest
Condit
Crowley
Deutsch

Granger
Gutierrez
Linder
Lipinski
McIntyre
Radanovich

Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Roukema
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Traffant
Vitter
Wexler

□ 2301

Messrs. BERMAN, REYES and SAWYER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE and myself that seeks to strike \$175 million from the Office of Justice Programs—Justice Assistance and provide those funds to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Unfortunately, the Supplemental Appropriations bill provides \$175 million for the Office of Justice Programs within the Department of Justice and that inhibits FEMA’s ability to consolidate terrorism preparedness programs and properly administer the First Responder Grant Program.

As we all know, in the past several years in response to various terrorist attacks, the United States has increased its efforts to address preparedness. Nationwide, training programs and response teams were created to assist emergency responders prepare for future terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Although all of the efforts were well intentioned, by 2001, more than 40 different federal agencies were offering over 90 training programs and over 100 response teams were created, which resulted in overlap and duplication of services and resources.

For the past seven years, our Committee has held numerous hearings that have come to the same conclusion as many independent groups, including GAO, the Rand and Gilmore Commission; we must consolidate our terrorism preparedness programs to avoid duplication and overlap to programs. By doing this, we will be better utilize the nation’s financial resources. The Administration came to the same conclusion and proposed centralizing “first responder” preparedness responsibilities within the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Office of National Preparedness, and the development of a “First Responder Grant Program.

At our hearing on the First Responders program in April 2002, FEMA provided detailed testimony outlining the Office of National Preparedness. The Department of Justice even voiced their support for the new office and stated on the record that Justice, “is doing everything possible to make this transition smooth, seamless, and effective.”

Currently, this bill does not provide FEMA any of the Administration's requested \$175 million for first responder grants necessary for effective preparedness in the event of a terrorist attack using a weapon of mass destruction. Not providing FEMA the money they've requested diminishes efforts to coordinate and properly train first responders. In addition, not providing FEMA the amount requested by the Administration in the Supplemental Appropriations bill hampers FEMA's ability to effectively implement the Administration's FY 2003 budget request for first responders.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to restore funding for FEMA's First Responder Grant Program. By supporting this amendment you support our efforts to better coordinate federal programs that will help our emergency responders prepare to aid our nation in the event of a terrorist attack.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, as sure as swallows returning to Capistrano, it seems like every year Congress considers a supplemental spending bill to fatten all the other appropriations bills we pass year. This is just a way to spend more than we said we would in the first place.

While I know there are many fine things the \$29 billion in this bill could buy, I have to wonder why these programs can't wait until the regular appropriations process, which is just about to begin. After all, we are already more than halfway through this fiscal year with just four months left to go before Fiscal Year 2003 arrives.

In truth, there are many provisions in this bill which are not really the result of an emergency and do not require "emergency spending." What is really going on, is that, as in previous supplemental appropriations bills, this one will allow Congress to circumvent the very spending caps it has set. In a wave of the magic wand, the \$29 billion contained in this bill will not count against those spending limitations. And therefore it will allow certain programs and departments to bulk up now so that there will be less pressure this summer for budget-busting increases in the regular appropriations bills.

Along with all the extra spending in this bill, there are unrelated measures that have been thrown in. This legislation will be used to raise the federal debt limit. With the federal debt nearing its ceiling, the Administration has asked Congress to raise the limit, but no bill has come to the House floor for consideration. We should have an open debate on the need to raise the debt limit, already at nearly \$6 trillion.

Also included in the supplemental spending bill is a rider changing how several counties in Pennsylvania are treated for the purpose of making Medicare payments to hospitals, and another that adds rural Orange and Dutchess counties in the urban area designation of New York City for the purpose of Medicare payments. The bill contains a trade measure requiring that knit and woven fabrics be dyed and finished in the U.S. in order to qualify for duty-free treatment under the African and Caribbean Trade Act. And this legislation allows the U.S. Postal Service to continue to use the bypass mail system in Alaska. Clearly, these are not emergencies.

We have criticized Enron and Arthur Andersen for using budget tricks to cook the books. We shouldn't pull the same sleight of hand on the taxpayers while throwing in unrelated pol-

icy riders. I ask my colleagues to join me and vote against this \$29 billion supplemental appropriations bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, if the GOP leadership is so sure that their supplementary appropriations bill promotes fiscal responsibility, why are they resorting to sneaky tactics such as the ones what we've seen in this bill?

How many times does the majority have to be called on their false promises to protect Social Security?

What kind of fools do they take the people of this country to be?

When are they going to level with the American public?

We're here arguing about raising the debt ceiling because at this time last year, the Republican leadership and the administration passed a \$1.3 trillion tax cut.

The irresponsible nature of that tax cut is made evident by the very fact that we have to raise the debt limit.

And once again, the Republican leadership is pushing for measures that jeopardize the future of the Social Security trust fund.

We've already borrowed from the Social Security trust fund to give the "Bill Gates of the world" a couple extra tax cuts and now we're going to borrow from the trust fund again to finance other programs.

Escalating public debt mortgages away our Social Security trust fund so why wouldn't we question the leadership's less than honest attempts to raise the debt ceiling.

Preserving the Social Security trust fund is not a new idea. At one time we had Republicans and Democrats alike pledging to keep the trust fund off limits. But when it comes down to it, the GOP leadership is not serious about ensuring basic retirement security for American workers.

The Republican's raid on Social Security has particular impact on the future of women. Women truly are the face of Social Security. Today, sixty percent of all Social Security recipients are women. Of recipients over age 85, nearly three-quarters are women.

Most of these women rely on Social Security for nearly 90% of their income. While they tend to live longer than men, women have fewer alternatives, fewer assets. Without Social Security's guaranteed, lifetime, inflation-protected benefits, over half of all elderly women would be poor.

After a lifetime of work, women often find themselves in dire economic straits during what is supposed to be their golden years.

The year is 2002, but women are still earning less than their male counterparts and are the ones expected to leave the workforce so that their children, and elder family members, are taken care of. This being the case, their Social Security benefits are extremely valuable to the quality of their retirement.

Fortunately, the current progressive system does not penalize women for these patterns of work wages and family obligations.

Social Security is structured to help those women with lower lifetime earnings and/or those who have taken time off to care for children.

In order for our daughters and our granddaughters to count on the Social Security benefits as we have come to know them to be, we must back up our pledges to save Social Security with legislative action that does not spend the trust fund.

With the large "Baby Boom generation" getting closer to retirement and their children right

behind, it's imperative that we reverse this downward spiral of deficit spending and exercise smart fiscal policy today.

It's time to have an honest debate about where our economy stands and how best to shore up the future of important domestic programs like Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, how this Congress spends our Federal funds says a lot about who we are as a nation—who we are as a people.

Make no mistake, we support the funding necessary to protect our country, but it takes more than a strong military to keep this country secure—our people must be strong too. That means we must invest in our children's future; preserve retirement benefits for our seniors and help working families.

Yet, the Republican leadership is asking us to support a supplemental appropriations bill that threatens all of these vital needs—now and far into the future. Talk about Teddy—the Republican plan will raise our Nation's debt ceiling and increase our children's debt. It means the Social Security trust fund will be raided, and domestic spending will be cut to make up the difference. That's just plain wrong!

It's time that my colleagues across the aisle look at the whole picture. National security isn't only about fighting the war on terrorism. It's also about fighting for our children's future. And, leaving them more debt is no way to make them strong.

Yet, with one narrow phrase in the supplemental bill, Republicans are laying the groundwork to endanger our children's future by raising the debt ceiling.

Even worse, we don't know by how much the GOP leadership plans to raise the ceiling.

The debt ceiling now stands at \$5.95 trillion. With a U.S. population of 281 million, the debt works out to an average of \$21,200 for every man, woman and child. The question is: After they're finished, how much will that amount increase?

Reports indicate Secretary O'Neill wants to increase it by \$750 billion, making the debt ceiling more than \$6.7 billion. This increases each person's portion to \$24,000.

But as far as we know, the House Republicans may be scheming for a debt ceiling that would make it \$30,000, \$40,000, who knows! All so that they can cover the cost of enacting last spring's fiscally irresponsible tax cut for the Nation's top 2%.

Isn't increasing the debt limit raising taxes but this time on our children and our grandchildren?

It's time for Congress to stop dancing around this issue, and bring the decision to increase the debt limit—for a defined amount into the light—to an open vote. Then we'd know who wants to take care of our children.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, today we spent much of the day talking about raising the debt limit. I think for most Americans, much of this debate, was difficult to follow because it focused on House procedure. What I would like to do is try to explain why this debate will have a negative effect on Social Security.

Currently, the Federal government does not have enough money to run its day to day operations. There are many reasons for this, including: a decline in the economy, a reduced tax revenue, the burst of the stock market bubble, and the President's \$1.7 trillion tax cut from last year.

In order to meet its obligations, the government borrows money. Much of the borrowing

comes from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, since it currently takes in more money than it pays out in benefits. So the government writes an "IOU" for the trust fund and uses the money to pay for its operations.

Currently, this is not a big deal. However, beginning in 2017, Social Security will pay out more than it takes in. In 2041, the trust funds' reserves are exhausted—in other words there is no more money to pay full benefits. The money the Federal government takes in will only pay for 73 percent of benefits.

Now here is where the debt ceiling comes in to play. The Federal government will need to borrow money so that it can continue paying for the Nation's defense, improvements to the roads, improved schools and teachers and many other things. It will also have to borrow to allow the government to continue paying full benefits for Social Security recipients.

The debt ceiling limits the amount of money the Federal government can borrow. If we raise the ceiling today, we will have to pay off a larger debt, we will have to pay more in interest, we will have to use more of the trust fund to finance the day-to-day operations of the government.

This makes it nearly impossible to address the needs of Social Security that millions of people depend on.

If we do not address Social Security, women will be particularly affected.

Sixty percent of all Social Security recipients are women. And without Social Security, over half of all elderly women would be poor.

Nearly two-thirds of all women 65 and older get half or more of their income from Social Security. Nearly one-third of those receive 90 percent or more of their income from Social Security.

On average, women spend about 14 fewer years in the workforce than men because of pregnancies and raising children. Therefore, our pensions tend to be smaller. But Social Security's spousal benefits protect us, ensuring that we have enough to get through retirement.

Social Security's progressive benefit formula provides women, and others, with benefits that are a higher percentage of their earnings. So despite a lifetime of lower earnings—on average, women earn 73 cents for every dollar that men earn—we will have adequate income for retirement and will live at a comfortable level.

And, since women generally live 6 to 8 years longer than men, we need to receive benefits for a longer period of time.

Under the Social Security's benefit formula, women will receive benefits for as long as they live. We do not need to worry about outliving our personal savings, which is a huge comfort for many us.

In short, Social Security is a vitally important program. It allows millions to retire in dignity and comfort.

Raising the debt ceiling makes it harder for the Federal government to meet its obligations.

We are, in effect, asking that our children and grandchildren increase their taxes, cut benefits and raise the retirement age for millions of potential beneficiaries so that we can avoid taking responsibility.

It is just plain unfair.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment today on behalf of the hospitals throughout Central and Southern Illinois.

Section 1404 of this bill would fix the Medicare funding problem for a few rural hospitals in Pennsylvania and New York, while the rest of the rural hospitals across America will continue to struggle including those in my district and all of downstate Illinois. It is unfortunate this area of concern is somewhat technical and complicated.

The area wage index is a scale used to adjust Medicare inpatient and outpatient payments to account for varying wage rates paid by hospitals for workers in different market areas across the country. Hospitals in areas with a higher wage index value receive higher Medicare prospective payments than hospitals in areas with a lower wage index value. An area wage index value is calculated for each metropolitan statistical area and rural area in each state. The rule that I opposed today places my hospitals at risk.

Many hospitals, especially those in rural areas, feel that their MSA does not coincide with their actual labor market area. Hospitals in metropolitan areas can afford to offer higher wages directly competing with rural hospitals for health care workers. Hospitals with a low wage index often times cannot afford to pay for the necessary labor in order to ensure quality care for their patients. However, Medicare law does allow hospitals to be reclassified from one MSA to another.

I support Mr. BALDACCIO'S amendment to strike Section 1404 of this bill, however, since that is not an option I feel that it is only fair for counties in rural Central and Southern Illinois to receive the same reclassification opportunity as those counties in New York and Pennsylvania. It is absolutely unacceptable to give preferential treatment to a few hospitals without considering the needs of all rural hospitals across America.

I do not have a problem with hospitals receiving a higher base payment rate. However, I do have a problem with this issue being stuck in this appropriations bill in this unfair manner. We need to look out for all of our citizens best interests, not just the interests of a select few.

Mr. Chairman, I know this is going to be ruled out of order. I am very disappointed in the outlandish process today. It reminds me of the Executive Sessions back door Open Meeting Act.

My father of 81 years of age is just recovering from a heart attack. If it were not for a small hospital in my home town, he possibly would not still be with us tonight. We need help just like any other place in the nation—urban or otherwise.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, remember when Republicans told us we had so much money in the treasury that we would run out of debt to redeem? When their majority leader was worried about a surplus of the surplus? And when our President told us there was plenty of money—enough to protect our country, leave Social Security untouched and still give a huge tax break to top income earners?

It wasn't very long ago that we heard such things, but that isn't what we face now.

We have a war, we have a recession and we have a tax cut. We need to pay for the war, work our way through the recession and take another look at the tax cut. It's just crazy to continue along as if nothing has happened with the budgeted tax cuts for top income earners that were adopted on the premise that we would have surpluses. We need to get to-

gether and take another stab at that plan—now that we know the surpluses are gone—to see whether we can manage all three: war, recession and tax cut. One thing we know is that we have to pay for the war efforts.

Where I come from we have a saying: When you find yourself in a hole, the first thing to do is stop digging.

I think this bill may be an attempt to use the war as cover: to pass a provision to allow the federal government to borrow billions of dollars from the Social Security trust fund. This is necessary not because of the war, but because of the earlier tax cuts. Where I come from most people tell me that they don't think it makes sense to borrow money from Social Security to fund that tax cut.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has conducted an analysis. What they found is this: the period for measuring solvency in the Social Security system is 75 years. Over that period the projected revenue loss for the tax cut will be \$5 trillion larger than the entire Social Security short-fall.

That, in the end, is why the debt ceiling needs to be raised and why, I believe, Republicans who said so recently "not to worry" don't want to have a recorded vote to borrow money.

America must be militarily strong to face the military challenge. Yet we must also acknowledge we cannot be militarily strong if we allow ourselves to become economically weak.

The people who send us here expect us to be honest with them, in times of war and peace but especially in war. My Democratic colleagues and I are insisting that we level with the American people and we'll continue to oppose this effort to drive America back into deficit spending and diverting the Social Security trust fund.

I've heard some of the older members in the Republican party defend their raid by saying that Democrats did it when they were in charge. Well, I have served in this House since 1995 and have only served in the minority. I served for 14 years in local government where our budgets had to balance each year. When I got here, we agreed—both Democrats and Republicans—that we would balance the budget and create a Social Security "lock box". That's been approved many times by nearly unanimous votes. It is pathetic to hear now that Republicans want to reject that pact we made with each other for the benefit of our country.

Yes, we are in a hole. We will need to raise the debt ceiling until we figure out how to stop digging, perhaps by freezing taxes. I think we should raise the ceiling for 60 days. That would give us time to meet—and get a plan to stop digging the hole. Let's vote the money for the war effort that both Democrats and Republicans supported in the Appropriations Committee, take out the riders that deal with things that have nothing to do with the war and have a separate vote to raise the debt ceiling 60 days. Let's take those 60 days, have a budget summit and get our fiscal act together.

Fighting the war and supporting our troops is something we all agree on. I would hope that we could also agree that it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to borrow money from Social Security to fund a tax break for the most affluent—a reverse Robin Hood move that takes from the least wealthy to give to the most wealthy.

We need to fund the war, but we don't need to wipe out Social Security to do it. And let's

remember that our soldiers and sailors have parents and grandparents too—people who need to count on Social Security being there in their old age.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, last night the Rules Committee amended Section 1404 of this bill to reclassify the location of hospitals for purposes of Medicare Reimbursements. But the Republican Leadership has crafted a rule that allows only certain counties in Pennsylvania and New York to receive adequate reimbursement in this amendment.

Unfortunately the current system for determining the wage index for medicare reimbursement rates for hospitals places some hospitals at a disadvantage. These hospitals may have similar labor costs to nearby hospitals. But because of the geographic classification and the nature of the reclassification system, certain hospitals have an advantage because they receive a higher level of reimbursement for wages and salaries.

There is no question that the hospitals located in the counties mentioned in this bill deserve to be reclassified so that they can receive a fair rate of reimbursement. The inadequate reimbursement rate is one reason why we constantly hear about hospitals going broke.

However, hospitals in my district deserve the same consideration. For this reason I offer this amendment with my colleague from Connecticut, Congressman SHAYS, that would reclassify hospitals in New Haven and Fairfield Counties so that they could qualify for the wage index that is used for nearby New York Metropolitan Statistical Area.

I know there are hospitals in the Chairman's District and also in my colleague across the aisle's district that would like this same consideration. Congressman VISCLOSKY spoke earlier this evening on how hospitals in his district were not included in these selective reclassification provisions even though he had contacted the Ways and Means Committee about this very problem. In fact, there is a list of members who have hospitals that should be eligible for geographic reclassification. Every one of those members could make a valid argument as to why their hospital is the one that should be taken care of in this bill.

This language is not budget neutral language. The amendments that the Rules Committee has allowed to be included will cost tens of millions of dollars—dollars that come at the expense of other hospitals across the nation.

Accordingly to preliminary estimates by the Congressional Budget Office, the geographic reclassification of hospitals in these Pennsylvania counties will cost approximately \$34 to \$35 million.

The New York Hospital Association predicts the change for certain New York hospitals could cost some where in the range of \$34 to \$40 million.

So again I ask, why are those counties getting special treatment? Why are certain hospitals in Pennsylvania and New York going to receive help in obtaining more equitable reimbursement for their services and not those in New Haven and Bridgeport, CT?

Hospitals in my district—and in many of my colleagues' districts—need and deserve the same treatment. Mr. Chairman, we should not selectively address the reclassification issue. We need to consider this issue in a fair and comprehensive bill.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4775, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO OF CONNECTICUT

Page 110, after line 20, insert the following:
TREATMENT OF A CERTAIN NEW ENGLAND COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA FOR PURPOSES OF REIMBURSEMENT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective for discharges occurring on or after October 1, 2002, for purposes of making payments under section 1886(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)) to hospitals located in the New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, Connecticut New England County Metropolitan Area, such hospitals are deemed to be located in the New York, New York, Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state once again what the controversy engaging us is about. From this member's perspective—it is not whether or not we should pass the Emergency Supplemental bill to help fund the war on terrorism. There is no debate about that; we all agree that we need to get this emergency money to the President to support our troops and beef up homeland security.

Each Member of this House wants to ensure that our men and women in uniform have all the tools and resources they need to win the war against global terrorism. If the debate were simply about whether to provide those resources, we would pass the bill rather quickly.

What is at issue here are the little—and the not so little—provisions attached to this bill.

First and foremost is the majority party's attempt to slip a \$750 billion increase in the National Debt through the House with no debate, no vote. I just can't go along with that.

Earlier today my colleague from Utah, JIM MATHESON, made a speech on the floor that particularly struck me. He said that a major problem with this clandestine move to rise the National Debt was the lack of "a plan" on how to regain some fiscal responsibility around this place. I couldn't agree more.

We have to get our fiscal house in order here in Washington. We have to have a plan. But the only plan I see is "Let's keep borrowing against our children's future."

We all come here representing different areas of the country. Often that leads us to having different priorities. But our job here is to find common ground to best represent the country as a whole. That requires that we work together—in a bipartisan way—to craft a fiscally disciplined budget for our country, just as a responsible family, or business does. It means making choices and prioritizing. It means being straight with the American people about what we can afford and what we can't.

I stand here as a Democrat who votes for the tax cut last year. I supported the effort to put more money back into people's pockets, to end the burden of the estate tax. But by making this choice, I knew that this would mean making other tough choices. Because you can't have everything.

So, for example, even though I represent a rural district, I voted against the \$200 billion Farm Bill. Among other problems, I believed it cost too much. Now, some of my colleagues may disagree with both votes. They may have wanted more farm spending or less tax reduction. But the issue for the House as a whole is whether or not we have a plan for balancing these competing priorities. Do we have a

schedule to bring back some fiscal sanity? Or are we just going to return to the old ways of endless borrowing against our children's future? Judging by what the majority wants to do with this debt ceiling increase—no plan, just keep borrowing—I would guess it is the latter. Mr. Chairman, that's just wrong.

If we are going to put the American people in debt by up to \$750 billion let's be straight about it. Let's tell them what we are doing and why. Let's have a vote on it. Let's be held responsible for the choices we make. Let's not hide behind legislative trickery to cover our tracks.

I am also concerned by another provision slipped into the rule. It will provide a band-aid to a few hospitals in Pennsylvania and upstate New York—without any sort of hearings or Committee consideration. And how are we doing this? We are cutting funds to hospitals across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, seniors in my district in California are clamoring for help. They are seeing their health care system dissolve before their eyes. And this Congress is using band aids to stop hemorrhaging in a couple of districts for political reasons. You don't have to be a nurse to see that that won't work.

In my district there is a health care crisis partly caused by Medicare. Many doctors in communities are refusing to see new patients and choosing early retirement because their Medicare rates have been cut. Medicare HMOs are cutting benefits, increasing cost sharing for seniors, and pulling out altogether because the Medicare Choice rates are still stagnant. Long Term Care facilities are already struggling to make ends meet and to provide quality care to our parents, grandparents, and great grandparents. And now they are facing a 17% cut in their funds from Medicare.

Clinics and other Medicaid providers are facing terrible cuts because many States can no longer afford to support them. And hospitals in my district are flirting with bankruptcy and disaster because Medicare is scheduled to cut their funds, they cannot find doctors, and the Medicare HMOs cannot, or will not, pay them enough.

Just today, the largest clinic in Santa Maria, California—Sansum Clinic—announced it would be closing its doors this summer. This closure will affect thousands of Santa Marians and have a devastating effect on health care delivery in the area. And to top this all off seniors still do not have prescription drug coverage.

This Congress needs to address the crisis in health care—and not just in the two counties that the House leadership wants to favor.

I would urge the House leadership to pull this bill and bring down the emergency supplemental that the Committee reported. Let's support our troops and leave the legislative maneuvering for another day.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, Thomas Jefferson once said: "The whole art of government consists of being honest." I've come here to speak today about transparency in government.

The Republican leadership is attempting to increase the amount the Federal Government can borrow—not through a direct, democratic vote—but by quietly slipping it into the Supplemental Appropriations bill. They're not specifying how much they want, they're not telling

us how they plan to spend it, and most importantly, they're not telling us how they plan to pay it back.

Why is telling the truth such a terrible thing to the Republicans? Why is the Republican majority afraid of being open and honest with the American people? I hope it's not about getting elections because this is about being fiscally responsible.

Every Member in this body knows that an increase in the debt limit has a monumental impact on our economy. However, under this Republican procedure, there is no chance to debate or to offer alternatives to one of the most important decisions made by this Congress.

The state of the economy affects the lives of all American families and businesses, not just today, but especially in the future as Baby Boomers begin to retire. We are in danger of placing an unnecessary burden on present and future generations.

The Federal Government is in a deficit, and under a Republican leadership, a \$4 trillion surplus has disappeared in one year—the largest fiscal reversal in our Nation's history.

Before approving a substantial increase in our borrowing authority we must review our long-term budget policies.

As elected officials charged with the public trust we must not act without a comprehensive plan. Just as we are clear with the goals of the supplemental appropriations bill, we should also be clear with the specific and transparent action on raising the debt limit. It should be a separate and distinct action.

I've listened to a majority of this debate and all the Republicans continue to say is "Where's your budget?" I sit on the budget committee. I participated in those discussions. And I'm here asking, Where is "your" budget? Where is your plan to restore us to balanced spending? Where is your plan to protect social security and Medicare? And where is your plan to protect the welfare of our children and grandchildren?

In light of the dramatic reversal in our Nation's fiscal condition, spurred in no small part by a reckless Republican tax cut, we should not, as the Republicans are proposing today, blindly pile debt onto future generations.

There is no doubt that this bill contains what we need to fight terrorism. We all agree that some of this spending is necessary. But let's pay for this war on terrorism without attaching extraneous provisions. Never forget that undue patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. Waving the flag for the war on terrorism should not be an excuse to cover mortgaging our future.

Supplemental appropriations bills are designed to be targeted spending in emergencies, not wish lists for proposals that would otherwise never stand the rigors of an open process.

Mr. Chairman, I stand on the floor today in full support of our troops fighting terrorism here and abroad. However, we can be strong militarily without becoming weak economically. We must take care of our people at home. Social Security must be protected, and Medicare for our seniors must be preserved.

It's simple math: The GOP tax cut + increase of the debt limit without a plan = The 1–2 punch to bring us back to an era of Reaganomics and deficit spending.

I heard that we are using the argument on Social Security and prescription drugs to scare

seniors. I say we are not scaring seniors. I say that what the Republican want to do with our budget is scary. We're just telling the American people they should be scared straight by the tactics of the Republican leadership.

In Summary: It's time for the House Republicans to be straightforward with the American people. I support an emergency supplemental bill, but we should not use it to bury provisions that would otherwise not see the light of day.

We need transparency within government and an honest and open process.

We need to practice fiscal responsibility.

We must ensure our national security, but we cannot forget our domestic responsibility.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to decry Republican efforts to use parliamentary gimmickry to sneak through a way to raise our Nation's debt ceiling.

We all know that the only reason that we are even discussing this increase to the Nation's debt is that the Republican economic plan has failed us. So now, the Republicans are refusing to face the music about the consequences of their trillion-dollar tax cut for the wealthy.

The Majority doesn't seem to want to be held accountable—so they are trying to bury this debt increase in our Nation's military supplemental spending bill.

In other words, the Majority wants to run up this Nation's debt to even greater heights without an open debate, and without an up-and-down vote on this issue. Mr. Chairman, this is an outrage!

Now I can't say that I blame my Republican colleagues for wanting to avoid this issue. In January 2001, the Congressional Budget Office was projecting that our Nation's debt ceiling of \$5.95 trillion would last for the next six years or more.

Unfortunately, the Republican's economic plan—and its tax cut for the wealthy—put us right back in an era of deficits. So here we are, forced to borrow money to make our Nation's ends meet, and forced to raise the Nation's debt limit again.

However, since my colleagues in the Republican party are trying to avoid discussing what increasing the debt limit will actually mean for America, I'm here to point out the consequences that this vote will have on our Nation's Social Security program.

We have already squandered all of our surpluses, which means that all of the funds from this debt limit increase will come directly from the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

The future of our Nation's most successful social program is in the balance, and we must let the American people know that the Republican leadership has put forth plans that could jeopardize the very system that so many Americans rely on.

We all know that Social Security is a critical safety net for our Nation's seniors. In my home state of Texas, one out of every ten residents depends on Social Security to provide vital income for themselves and their families. Nationwide, two-thirds of our seniors—women and men—count Social Security benefits as the majority of their income.

We all know that it is women who have the greatest benefit from Social Security. We generally live longer, make less, and have smaller pensions than men do. These benefits are particularly important to women in Texas. Without these vital retirement benefits,

564,000 women in the Lone Star State would fall below the poverty line.

For African American and Hispanic women especially, this program is more than just retirement insurance. Women of color disproportionately rely on this system for its disability and widow benefits. Social Security is also a critical safety net that protects African American children.

For all these reasons, I want to make sure that everyone knows just how much is at stake for our community when we talk about keeping Social Security strong.

Right now, there are proposals before the Congress to alter the structure of Social Security. Yet, no one in the Republican leadership seems to be willing to talk about these plans. Sound familiar? No one on the other side of the aisle wants to talk about raising our Nation's debt, either.

Well, we Democrats are not going to let Republicans keep our Nation in the dark about this. We know that we must protect and strengthen Social Security. We know that America can be strong militarily without becoming weak economically. And we know that the American public deserves open debate on the financial future of our Nation.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would add Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties to the list of six Pennsylvania counties in section 1404 that were arbitrarily moved to Newberg, NY–PA MSA according to a self-enacting provision in the rule passed yesterday.

Section 1404 of this bill directs the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board to deem certain counties in Northeastern Pennsylvania to be located in a more advantageous Metropolitan Statistical Area for the purposes of computing reimbursement under the Medicare program.

The two counties in my district are adjacent to the six counties listed in Section 1404 and find themselves in similar economic circumstances. My amendment would simply move the counties in my Congressional District to a new MSA along with the six counties already in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, if my amendment has the opportunity to be voted on, I am confident it will pass, based on the success of the amendment adopted earlier today in the rule.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my opposition to Section 1404 of this bill. While I had considered offering an amendment to strike this provision, I recognize that such an amendment would be out of order. Instead, I want to take this opportunity to state my deep concern over the effects that this measure will have, with the hope that this situation can be improved in the remainder of the legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, this provision would assist a mere handful of hospitals in a few geographic areas, at the expense of every other hospital in the country. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to drain funding from any of our nation's hospitals, especially as we debate a bill that is meant to strengthen our ability to respond to medical emergencies that could strike anywhere across the nation.

Mr. Chairman, hospitals in my State of Maine cannot afford any further reimbursement cuts, no matter how small. My state already has the 5th-lowest Medicare reimbursement rate in the country. Our hospitals are operating on razor-thin margins. In a state as

geographically large as Maine, we already struggle with access to medical services. Further cuts will only exacerbate the problem.

This provision is a clear case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. In fact, it's even worse because there are just a few select Pauls, and a national full of Peters. Why should the vast majority of Members tell their seniors that their access to care may be jeopardized by a gift to a few select hospitals somewhere else? How can we effectively fight AIDS and infectious diseases through increased spending in this bill, when at the same time we weaken our hospitals? What sense does it make to give money to speed our first response to attacks, while at the same time taking funds from the hospitals who would be on the front line?

Mr. Chairman, I know all too well that the geographic adjustment system for Medicare payment rates needs reform. My State of Maine is among the most egregiously affected by the current system, and I would be happy to work with any of my colleagues who wish to seek reform to make reimbursement rates more equitable. I strongly support improved reimbursement for all our nation's hospitals. However, this provision in this bill only benefits a select few facilities, and will detract from the ability of all others to meet their obligations to Medicare beneficiaries.

Section 1404 is unfair, it's unjust, and it's just plain bad policy. It certainly does not belong in an Emergency Supplemental. Since we cannot remove this provision today, I am hopeful that we can fix the problem in conference. This bill funds vital areas like defense, security and health, and the final bill should not be marred by this destructive measure.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not in any way question the patriotism of my Republican colleagues. Nor should they question mine. And I most certainly have the greatest respect for Chairman YOUNG who worked with the minority and reported out of committee a bipartisan bill that provides needed funding to support our military and our Nation's fight against terrorism.

It is for this reason that I am absolutely baffled that my Republican colleagues are allowing their leadership to muddy up this bill so critical to the safety of our troops and our Nation's security.

It is unconscionable that the Republican leadership has made it necessary to delay passage of this bill because of their addition of ill-conceived and irresponsible provisions that have nothing to do with supporting our troops or defending our country's security.

I therefore implore my Republican colleagues to insist that the national interests of this country are put before the political interests of their leadership.

Help us strip the bill of this underhanded attempt to burden America's taxpayers and increase the national debt limit by 750 billion dollars . . . which in effect is a 750 billion dollar overdraft of our Nation's checking account.

What makes the actions of the Republican leadership even worse is that we are already in deficit due to the earlier irresponsible economic policies of the majority.

As a result, what the Republican leadership is doing tonight, under the guise of national security, will come at the unnecessary expense of our children's future and the destabilization of the social security and medicare trust funds.

Many of my Republican colleagues have come to the floor and challenged our patriotism for questioning and debating the extraneous additions to this bill.

Such criticism is misplaced and quite offensive.

In fact, it is the Republican leadership that is turning their backs on our military by making a sham of the very democracies and freedoms our troops are fighting for and sacrificing their lives to protect.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday my respected colleague, Chairman YOUNG, stated that this war-time supplemental is a must-pass bill for the security of our troops and our Nation.

I could not agree more.

Therefore I urge my Republican colleagues to put a stop to this ill-conceived and divisive strategy to raise the debt limit and to do the right thing by allowing us to pass a national security bill that Democrats, Republicans, the President and the American people can proudly support.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, the Intelligence Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as a veteran, as a Democrat, as a citizen of this nation, I strongly support the funding in this bill for fighting the war against terrorism and for rebuilding New York. I strongly support the funding in this bill to secure our borders. We all support these provisions. I applaud the Appropriations Committee for putting together a bill that we can all vote for and send to the President.

The Republican leadership decided to take a good bill and play politics. The Republican leadership decided to take a bill that is designed to fight a war, to keep our soldiers safe, to secure our ports-of-entry, and decided to add provisions that they didn't want to deal with and debate on their own merits.

The Republican leadership doesn't want the American people to know that they are seeking to raise the debt limit, to add \$750 billion to our nation's credit card, without having a single member of this body vote on raising the debt limit. They don't want the American people to know that they need to raise this debt limit in part because of their fiscally irresponsible tax cuts that mainly benefitted the wealthiest in the country and ignored the needs of the working class.

If we are going to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion, we owe it to our constituents to let them know what we are doing and to have an honest and full debate on this floor. Let's stand here and debate the reasons we need to raise the debt limit. If we need to raise this debt limit because we are at war, as the Republicans say, let's talk about it and get all the facts out. I would welcome the opportunity to talk about the fiscal policy of the Republican party that has put us in this situation. Let's confront this issue instead of trying to sneak it into a bipartisan emergency supplemental appropriations bill that we all support.

Last night, the Speaker of the House said that if we voted against this bill, we would be "voting against our military" and we would be "voting against those people in New York." I say to the Speaker and to my friends on the other side of the aisle that you are the ones who made this "war-time" supplemental political. You are the ones politicizing this issue. You should be ashamed of your actions to try and fool the American people.

I am about to depart on a CODEL with a number of my colleagues to visit our troops in Korea and Uzbekistan. I have visited troops in Bosnia, in Germany, in Turkey, and in Afghanistan. I participate in these CODELs so that I will never lose sight of what I am doing in Congress and what those brave young men and women are doing for us each day. This debate, these actions by the Republican leadership, make it clear that too many people in this body have lost sight of what we are supposed to do here. This bill should be about homeland defense, about national security, about taking care of our troops who are spilling their blood for us. Instead, this bill has become a political mess because of the action of the Republican leadership. They should be ashamed.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I'm a proud American. We stand together in defense of our nation. I come to the floor today in full support of our troops fighting terrorism here and abroad. House Democrats are fully committed to winning the war on terrorism and once again making America safe from harm.

Unfortunately, House Republicans are using the war to pass a dangerous and cynical provision that allows the Federal Government to break its own spending limit and take hundreds of billions of dollars from the Social Security Trust Fund.

The war is not what we are arguing about today. What we object to is the effort to use this supplemental spending bill to increase the national debt and hide that increase with gimmicks and deception.

In short, Republicans spent all their money before they paid their bills. Would you write a check before you put money in the bank. The Republican budget used up 100 percent of the projected surplus. It left no margin for error, and put us on a course to run up our debt.

Now the Republicans are trying to increase the debt without any debate or vote. Most importantly, the increased debt would be paid for from Social Security trust fund. Every dollar in additional debt incurred is another dollar taken away from Social Security and Medicare.

How is this increase in debt going to affect seniors, children, and other Americans who depend on us to protect them. This is like taking your families hard earned money to a gambling facility and hoping you come away with enough to pay for your future.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle and the president need to understand that we can defeat terrorism without destroying Social Security. I am staunchly opposed to the Republicans' plan to raid social security to pay for other programs that they didn't consider when they passed their tax cut for corporations and the wealthy.

Members on the other side were very willing to stand up and take credit when they passed the tax cut bill that put us in this mess. They should be willing to stand up and be counted now that it has come time to pay the bills by raising the debt limit.

I would like to see four things happen: First, I want a responsible, honest, and bipartisan budget; second, I want to protect and strengthen Social Security; I want to ensure that we meet our obligations today so that our children are not burdened with debt, and; I want a budget summit called so that we can begin to fix this fiscal nightmare that we find ourselves in.

Congress must work with the Administration to put the fiscal house back together again. If American families ran their finances the way the Republicans have run the nations, they'd be living in the dark and taking showers in the rain.

America can be strong militarily without becoming weak economically. Let's work toward achieving that goal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this supplemental appropriations bill contains funds urgently needed by our Armed Services to fight the war on terrorism. I support this bill because I believe that we must provide these much needed resources to our armed services as promptly as possible. However, I take this opportunity to address two important issues that should have further debate, and on which the House should vote separately.

A year ago, budget projections were forecasting huge surpluses for many years to come. Today, the federal budget is in deficit, and now the majority wants to borrow more money without having a long-term plan to get us out of the deficit. Whether you think we should raise the debt limit or not, we should at the very least have a long-term budget plan to eradicate the deficit. Without a plan, the majority seeks to finance the deficit by raiding the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, which places these funds at long-term great peril, and creates a burden unfairly imposed upon our children and grandchildren.

It is especially disappointing that the House did not have any opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on raising the debt limit. Instead, parliamentary tricks were used to insert the provision in this bill. It is my hope that the Senate will not let this type of gimmickry stand. Both the House and Senate should vote directly on whether or not to raise the debt limit.

There is a second objectionable provision in this bill: it contains language that dramatically weakens the Endangered Species Act. Section 705 exempts the Department of Defense from complying with the Endangered Species Act's requirements that off-base impacts of proposed DoD decisions be considered. This language exempts DoD actions related to off-base water consumption that threaten imperiled species or their habitats. During debate on the 2003 Department of Defense Authorization bill, I objected to similar environmental attacks in Committee and joined Congressman RAHALL in offering an amendment to strike these exemptions for debate on the floor. A blanket environmental legislative exemption to the Department of Defense is not needed. The Secretary of Defense already has the ability to waive provisions of the Endangered Species Act for national security purposes under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Chairman, while I vigorously support our Armed Services, I reluctantly support this bill and hope that Senate will act quickly to both provide our troops necessary resources to complete their mission, and correct the clear deficiencies in the legislation before us today.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to voice my support for our war against terrorism here and abroad. However, I stand here today to also voice my strong concerns for our future economic outlook and the outlook for the Social Security Trust Fund.

We have been talking about raising the debt limit to \$750 billion that puts us back on track to deficit spending. Instead of debating an honest and clean war-time supplemental bill, we have a disingenuous rule that extends into far reaching areas that poses to raise our debt ceiling level. What is more worrisome is where this money will be coming from—the Social Security Trust Fund.

In order to pay for other programs, the Republican path will force us to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. This presents a bleak outlook for the future of Social Security.

The movement of funds out of the Social Security Trust Fund will have a negative impact on future beneficiaries—specifically women. Women depend disproportionately on Social Security for several key reasons.

Women traditionally have been the caretakers of our families, where many leave their jobs to take care of their children or other family members. Women live longer and earn less than their male counterparts (73 cents to the dollar) and typically are more likely to work in lower-wage service-sector jobs, where retirement planning is not as common. For these reasons, a woman's earning over her lifetime will be significantly less—14 years of less earning in comparison to their male counterparts.

For these reasons, women depend heavily on Social Security benefits. If we drain the Trust Fund of its resources, beneficiaries, and women in particular, will be hard hit. It is obvious that ensuring that the Social Security Trust Fund is strong for our future is essential, especially for women.

This issue is of crucial importance for minority women for the reasons already mentioned, but their dependence is even greater. Women of color have a huge stake in seeing that Social Security is not burdened, as they rely even more heavily on Social Security for their retirement income than do whites of either gender or men of color.

African-American women and Hispanic women tend to have even lower lifetime earnings than other cultural and gender groups, and also have long life spans on average. They tend to work in lower-wage jobs that don't offer retirement or pension plans.

Moreover, they draw disproportionately on Social Security benefits for disabled workers and for families of workers who become disabled or die prematurely. About one in five African-American and Hispanic beneficiaries are under the age of 55, compared to only one in ten whites. African-American women in particular rely greatly on these non-retirement benefits because they have a higher rate of disability than whites of either gender and they and their families often survive deceased husbands.

One in five African-American married couples rely on Social Security for all of their income in retirement. For 80 percent of nonmarried elderly African-American and Hispanic women, Social Security provides over half of their income in retirement, and over half of older African-American and Hispanic widows depend on Social Security for 90 percent of their retirement income. These statistics ring loudly.

The security of Social Security benefits also extends to children. 23 percent of the children who receive the survivor's benefit are African-American children. In fact, African American children are almost four times more likely to

be lifted out of poverty by Social Security than are white children. This is also a children's issue.

Instead of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, we need to work together to ensure that it is strengthened and not weakened. We need to ensure that each and every dollar in the Social Security Trust Fund is spent on Social Security. We cannot smash the lockbox and raid it blindfolded without weighing the consequences for our future.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, following the terrorist attacks of September 11th, we face new challenges throughout the world. While we work around the clock to ensure our nation's security, we must also work to ensure that the fundamental principles of democracy, human rights and justice are upheld.

I would like to focus for a moment on the South Caucasus. As my colleagues know, securing open borders and ensuring regional cooperation in the South Caucasus have become increasingly important U.S. policy goals. Achieving these goals is not only critical to the United States and the global war against terrorism, but also for the countries in the region.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I am keenly aware of the many challenges facing these countries and the need for open borders, regional stability and peace. Given Turkey's ongoing blockade of Armenia, I welcomed President Bush's April 24th Armenian Genocide commemoration statement whereby he called on Turkey to restore economic, political, and cultural links with Armenia. Once this happens, U.S. legislation such as the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act will no longer be necessary. As a result of the economic assistance provided to Turkey in this supplemental bill and Turkey's blockade of Armenia, Turkey will be subject to the requirements of the Corridor Act. As many know, the Corridor Act prohibits U.S. economic assistance to any country that prohibits or restricts the transfer or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance to another country.

In the South Caucasus, Turkey's blockade of Armenia restricts the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Armenia. Unless President Bush waives the requirements of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, Turkey will not be able to receive the economic assistance provided in this bill.

Therefore, I encourage Turkey to normalize relations with Armenia and urge President Bush to carefully review the waiver of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to share my concerns about the effect that the supplemental spending bill we debate here today will have on Social Security beneficiaries, and particularly on the women of this country who depend on Social Security for their livelihood.

Without question, this supplemental spending bill is very important, and includes vital funding for the war on terrorism, homeland security and much-needed aid for my home state of New York. However, I am concerned that these priorities are being paid for with the Social Security benefits which are of the utmost importance to countless Americans. The retirement security of both men and women rests on the decisions that Congress must make regarding this vital program.

Women are especially dependent on Social Security. Currently, over 60% of all Social Security beneficiaries are women. Among beneficiaries aged 85 or older, 75% are women. And most of these women rely on Social Security for almost 90% of their income. Unfortunately, women often have less pension income and personal savings than men. Social Security provides women, who live longer and make less money than men, with a secure source of retirement income.

Social Security has allowed generations of women to live with independence and dignity. No plan for increasing defense spending or any other important priority should simultaneously threaten the livelihood of women retirees who, without Social Security would have nowhere else to turn. I urge my colleagues to think carefully about the spending priorities of this Congress, and to preserve Social Security for current beneficiaries and future generations.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the supplemental bill under consideration before the House today. My opposition is predicated on the fact that through this bill we are raiding the Social Security System.

The path of deficit spending that this bill maps out will do irreparable harm to current and future retirees who rely on, or will rely on Social Security for retirement income.

I am particularly concerned about the plight of women who rely on Social Security. Last year the President and the House majority leadership promised that every dollar of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses would be saved for Social Security and Medicare. Now, those commitments are being cast aside like useless counterfeit money. Let's examine who will suffer and how they will suffer.

The facts of the matter are: Women constitute the majority of beneficiaries, approximately 60 percent of the recipients over the age of 65, and roughly 72 percent of the beneficiaries above the age of 85 are women. Furthermore, women rely disproportionately on Social Security benefits.

27 percent of women over the age of 65 rely on Social Security for 90 percent of their income.

Among Elderly widows, Social Security provides nearly 75 percent of their income.

The current strategy to raid the Social Security and Medicare lock boxes will spend 93 percent of the Social Security surplus over the next five years! The casualties from this wrong-headed policy will be women and minorities.

Women of this House are resolute in our collective refusal not to be victimized by a supplemental bill that is short sighted, and which will hasten the insolvency of Social Security. Clearly, Social Security is projected to cost more in the future largely because the number of Americans (especially women) over age 65 will grow faster than the number of workers. We must prepare for this eventuality.

Therefore, I call upon my colleagues to stand firm and resist efforts to raid America's trust, our Social Security and Medicare System. We must staunchly defend against those who propose to loot the system and bankrupt it. We must preserve a sacred trust, so that widows and elderly women will have the retirement income they have earned and which has been promised to them.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word. I rise in opposition to this bill.

There are many provisions in this bill that I support. I strongly believe, for example, that we must increase our investment in security for nuclear facilities.

I also agree that we need funding for enhanced security at U.S. ports and improved airport protections. If those measures, truly emergency issues, were up for a separate vote, I would strongly support them.

However, on the whole I do not believe this bill, as written, serves the interests of the American people.

In its military spending, this bill continues to echo the patterns of the Cold War, including continued support for a weapons system the Secretary of Defense has very clearly stated he neither wants nor needs.

It includes dangerous provisions that dramatically expand the U.S. role in the decades-old Colombian civil war.

It provides millions of dollars to regimes with very dark human rights records with little oversight of how that money will be spent.

It prohibits any U.S. participation in or even cooperation with the International Criminal Court.

This bill is supposed to be about emergency spending, but instead it is loaded with favors to defense contractors, big oil companies, and Republican members from a few areas.

This bill includes millions for protecting a pipeline in Colombia. Since when was an Occidental Petroleum pipeline in Colombia a national emergency?

In contrast, there are real emergencies that this bill fails to address fully, including the global HIV/AIDS pandemic.

While the supplemental appropriations bill does include funding for the global AIDS, TB and Malaria crises, I am extremely disappointed that the amendment offered by my colleague, Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, which would have increased funding to \$750 million for this priority, was defeated in the House Appropriations Committee.

In addition to AIDS being the greatest humanitarian crisis of our time, HIV/AIDS has been declared a threat to our national security by the CIA.

AIDS, TB and Malaria kill over 15,000 people each day. That means 5.4 million people each year.

Without stronger U.S. leadership, more and more people will die.

The U.S. can and must do more. This is an emergency. And \$200 million is not enough.

While most of the money in this bill isn't paid for or off-set, the Republican leadership is continuing to look for any excuse to cut federal funding for another urgent situation, our housing programs. This bill cuts another \$600 million from low-income housing programs. This continues an absurd trend of the GOP rescinding, cutting, or diverting more than \$20 billion in housing money since they took over in 1994.

We face a housing crisis in my district in the Bay Area and in many other parts of the country. And yet, these unconscionable cuts continue, putting the dream of home ownership further and further out of the reach of millions.

So with its Cold War approach to defense spending, pork barrel projects, dangerous steps in Colombia and elsewhere, and short-falls for real emergencies such as AIDS and housing, I cannot support this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I am stunned that this leadership can take an over-

whelmingly popular and important measure, a measure that passed through Committee by voice vote, and load it with so many controversial provisions.

This measure employs procedural gimmicks that silence the voice of both Democrat and Republican alike. Whether the issue is Social Security, defense, budget, taxes, retirement—you name it—we're cut off. Amendments are blocked and debate shut down.

Today, however, this leadership has truly outdone itself. The Leadership has inserted technical language into the Supplemental bill that will allow a huge increase in the debt limit to occur without an up-or-down vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. This stealth maneuver will provide a germane hook so that Republicans can later insert a debt limit increase into the conference report.

This leadership is asking us to ignore its fiscal mismanagement of the budget and its inability to stick to the budget policies that fostered federal budget surpluses—not deficits. This rule does nothing to address the burgeoning public debt and mortgages the Social Security Trust Fund.

This leadership is simply not dealing in reality. There refusal to engage in any debate on raising the debt ceiling is just the latest in a pattern of running roughshod over the rules of the House. Just last month, this leadership gutted an adoption tax credit bill to ensure consideration of legislation making the President's tax cut permanent through this body—without having a real debate. This leadership refuses to acknowledge that making the tax cut permanent will diminish the government's financial standing by \$4 trillion just as the Baby Boom retirement reaches full force, between 2013 and 2022.

BUDGET PICTURE

Let's take a step back and really look at how we got here. The deterioration of the budget outlook over the past 12 months is truly stunning. President Bush came to office with an unprecedented budgetary bounty—eight consecutive years of budget improvement yielded four years of surplus and \$453 billion in repayment of publicly held debt.

No increase in the debt ceiling has been needed since 1997 and, last year, the Administration predicted that we would not need a debt limit increase until 2008, even with enactment of the President's tax cut. But, by August 2001, well before September 11th, Treasury was indicating that the debt ceiling would need to be raised next year. Thus, assertions that the debt problem is the result of September 11th or the war on terrorism simply don't wash.

Today, the ten-year \$5.6 trillion surplus seems like a pipe-dream and we must adjust to a new reality—long-term deficits. The interests of the people of my district or the nation, at large, are not served by moving the goal posts, with respect to debt, and not setting forth a plan to get the budget back on track.

INTEREST RATES

I would also note that by increasing the national debt, we run the risk of raising interest rates and consequently enacting a massive tax cut on all Americans. Over the past year, time and again, the Federal Reserve has reduced short term rates. Nevertheless, long-term rates have remained high, preventing Americans from realizing savings on variable mortgages, new mortgages, auto loans, or credit card payments. Thus, the return to deficits and a growing debt has effectively denied

a tax cut to millions of Americans by keeping long-term rates high.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks announced that the Senate has passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3448.

S. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3448) "An Act to improve the ability of the United States to prevent, prepare for, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at midnight.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4775, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-486) on the resolution (H. Res. 431) providing for further consideration of the bill

(H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY, MAY 24, 2002

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 23, 2002 it adjourn to meet at 1:00 a.m. on Friday, May 24, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 189, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—211

- Aderholt, Duncan, Issa, Akin, Dunn, Istook, Arney, Ehlers, Jenkins, Bachus, Ehrlich, John, Baker, Emerson, Johnson (CT), Ballenger, English, Johnson (IL), Barr, Everett, Johnson, E. B., Bartlett, Ferguson, Johnson, Sam, Barton, Flake, Jones (NC), Bass, Fletcher, Keller, Bereuter, Foley, Kelly, Biggert, Forbes, Kennedy (MN), Bilirakis, Fossella, Kerns, Blunt, Frelinghuysen, King (NY), Boehlert, Gallegly, Kingston, Bono, Ganske, Kirk, Boozman, Gekas, Knollenberg, Brady (TX), Gibbons, Kolbe, Brown (SC), Gilchrest, LaHood, Bryant, Gillmor, Latham, Burr, Gilman, LaTourette, Buyer, Goode, Leach, Callahan, Goodlatte, Lewis (CA), Calvert, Goss, Lewis (KY), Camp, Graham, LoBiondo, Cannon, Graves, Lucas (OK), Cantor, Green (WI), Lynch, Capito, Greenwood, Maloney (CT), Carson (OK), Grucci, Manzullo, Castle, Gutknecht, McCrery, Chabot, Hansen, McHugh, Chambliss, Hart, McInnis, Coble, Hastert, McKeon, Collins, Hastings (WA), Mica, Cooksey, Hayes, Miller, Dan, Crane, Hayworth, Miller, Gary, Crenshaw, Herger, Miller, Jeff, Cubin, Hilleary, Moran (KS), Davis, Jo Ann, Hobson, Morella, Davis, Tom, Hoekstra, Myrick, Deal, Horn, Nethercutt, DeLay, Hostettler, Ney, DeMint, Houghton, Northup, Diaz-Balart, Hunter, Norwood, Doolittle, Hyde, Nussle, Dreier, Isakson, Osborne

- Ose, Saxton, Taylor (NC), Otter, Schaffer, Terry, Oxley, Schrock, Thomas, Paul, Sensenbrenner, Thornberry, Pence, Sessions, Thune, Petri, Shadegg, Tiahrt, Pickering, Shaw, Tiberi, Pitts, Shays, Toomey, Platts, Sherwood, Upton, Pombo, Shimkus, Walden, Portman, Shuster, Walsh, Pryce (OH), Simmons, Wamp, Putnam, Simpson, Quinn, Skeen, Watkins (OK), Ramstad, Smith (MI), Weldon (FL), Regula, Smith (NJ), Weldon (PA), Rehberg, Smith (TX), Weller, Reynolds, Souder, Whitfield, Rogers (KY), Stump, Wicker, Rogers (MI), Sullivan, Wilson (NM), Rohrabacher, Sununu, Wilson (SC), Ros-Lehtinen, Sweeney, Wolf, Royce, Tancredo, Young (AK), Ryan (WI), Tauzin, Young (FL), Ryun (KS), Taylor (MS)

NAYS—189

- Abercrombie, Hill, Oberstar, Ackerman, Hilliard, Obey, Allen, Hinchey, Olver, Andrews, Hoeffel, Ortiz, Baca, Holden, Owens, Baird, Holt, Pallone, Baldacci, Honda, Pascrell, Baldwin, Hooley, Pastor, Barcia, Hoyer, Payne, Barrett, Inslee, Pelosi, Becerra, Israel, Peterson (MN), Berkley, Jackson (IL), Phelps, Berman, Jackson-Lee, Pomeroy, Berry, (TX), Price (NC), Bishop, Jefferson, Rahall, Blagojevich, Jones (OH), Rangel, Blumenauer, Kanjorski, Reyes, Borski, Kaptur, Rivers, Boswell, Kennedy (RI), Rodriguez, Boucher, Kildee, Roemer, Boyd, Kilpatrick, Ross, Brady (PA), Kind (WI), Rothman, Brown (FL), Kleczka, Roybal-Allard, Brown (OH), Kucinich, Rush, Capps, LaFalce, Sabo, Capuano, Lampson, Sanchez, Cardin, Langevin, Sanders, Carson (IN), Lantos, Sandlin, Clay, Larsen (WA), Sawyer, Clayton, Clement, Larson (CT), Kildeer, Schakowsky, Boyd, Kilpatrick, Ross, Brady (PA), Kind (WI), Rothman, Brown (FL), Kleczka, Roybal-Allard, Brown (OH), Kucinich, Rush, Capps, LaFalce, Sabo, Capuano, Lampson, Sanchez, Cardin, Langevin, Sanders, Carson (IN), Lantos, Sandlin, Clay, Larsen (WA), Sawyer, Clayton, Clement, Larson (CT), Lee, Levin, Schiff, Conyers, Lewis (GA), Scott, Costello, Lofgren, Serrano, Coyne, Lowey, Shows, Cramer, Lucas (KY), Luther, Skelton, Cummings, Maloney (NY), Slaughter, Davis (CA), Markey, Smith (WA), Davis (FL), Markey, Snyder, Davis (IL), Mascara, Solis, DeGette, Matheson, Spratt, Delahunt, Matsui, Stenholm, DeLauro, McCarthy (MO), Strickland, Dicks, McCarthy (NY), Stupak, Dingell, McCollum, Tanner, Doggett, McDermott, Tauscher, Engel, McGovern, Thurman, Eshoo, McKinney, Tierney, Etheridge, McNulty, Towns, Evans, Meehan, Turner, Farr, Meek (FL), Turner, Fattah, Meeks (NY), Udall (CO), Filner, Menendez, Udall (NM), Ford, Millender, Velazquez, Frank, McDonald, Vislosky, Frost, Miller, George, Waters, Gephardt, Mink, Watson (CA), Gonzalez, Mollohan, Watt (NC), Gordon, Moore, Waxman, Green (TX), Moran (VA), Weiner, Hall (TX), Murtha, Wexler, Harman, Nadler, Woolsey, Hastings (FL), Napolitano, Wu, Hefley, Neal, Wynn

NOT VOTING—35

- Bentsen, Condit, Deutsch, Boehner, Cox, Dooley, Bonilla, Crowley, Doyle, Bonior, Culberson, Edwards, Burton, Cunningham, Granger, Combest, DeFazio, Gutierrez

Hall (OH)
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Linder
Lipinski
McIntyre

Peterson (PA)
Radanovich
Riley
Roukema
Stark
Stearns

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Traffant
Vitter
Watts (OK)

□ 0023

Mr. POMEROY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. DEGETTE, and Messrs. SNYDER, DAVIS of Illinois, TURNER, CLAY, DELAHUNT and OWENS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAKER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. BEREUTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1644. An act to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3167. An act to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 24, 2002, at 1 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7037. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7038. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Thomas R. Wilson, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7039. A letter from the Director, FDIC Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the

Corporation's final rule—Technical Amendments to FDIC Regulation Relating to Forms, Instructions, and Reports (RIN: 3064-AC52) received May 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7040. A letter from the Director, FDIC Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Capital Treatment of Recourse, Direct Credit Substitutes and Residual Interests in Asset Securitizations [Docket No. 2001-68] (RIN: 1550-AB11) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7041. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Home Mortgage Disclosure [Regulation C; Docket No. R-1001] received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7042. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—PBGC Benefit Payments (RIN: 1212-AA82) received May 15, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7043. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's performance report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA) for fiscal year 2001, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g nt.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7044. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (McCall, Idaho and Pinesdale, Montana) [MM Docket No. 01-93, RM-10076] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7045. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revision of the Commission's Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems: Petition of City of Richardson, Texas [CC Docket No. 94-102] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7046. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, TV Broadcast Stations (Elk City, Oklahoma and Borger, Texas) [MM Docket No. 01-134, RM-10137] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7047. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Oswego and Granby, New York) [MM Docket No. 00-169 RM-9953] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7048. A letter from the Legal Advisor to Chief, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act of 1999; Broadcast Signal Carriage Issues [CS Docket No. 00-96] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7049. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, MMB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Savoy, Texas) [MM Docket No. 01-149; RM-10173; RM-10175] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7050. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines [Docket No. RM96-1-019; Order No. 587-N] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7051. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on economic conditions in Egypt 2000 through 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

7052. A letter from the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Director, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Arab Emirates for defense articles and service estimated to cost \$245 million (Transmittal No. 02-27) received May 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7053. A letter from the Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation/CFO, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Competitive Sourcing Studies, 2002-2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7054. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Executive Order 13202, Preservation of Open Competition and Government Neutrality Towards Government Contractors' Labor Relations on Federal and Federally Funded Construction Projects [FAC 2001-05; FAR Case 2000-016 (stay)] (RIN: 9000-AJ14) received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7055. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Explanation and Justification for Revised Form 5 and Schedule E of Form 3X, Regarding Reporting of Independent Expenditures—received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7056. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV-094-FOR] received May 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7057. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Recreational Fishery Closure [Docket No. 001226367-0367-01; I.D. 102201A] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7058. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bycatch Rate Standards for the First Half of 2002 [I.D. 121701E] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7059. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; Hawaii-based Pelagic Fisheries Longline-Restrictions and Seasonal Area Closure, and Sea Turtle and Sea Bird Mitigation Measures [Docket No. 010511123-1123-01; I.D. 042001D] (RIN: 0648-AP24) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7060. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Request for Proposals for FY 2002—NOAA Educational Partnership Program with Minority Serving Institutions: Environmental Entrepreneurship Program [Docket No. 020325068-2068-01] (RIN: 0648-AB17) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7061. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 110801D] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7062. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Transfer [Docket No. 010208032-1109-02; I.D. 110701E] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7063. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increase [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 011802A] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7064. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Foreign Fishing and Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; 2002 Specifications and Foreign Fishing Restrictions [Docket No. 011005244-2011-02; I.D. No. 092401D] (RIN: 0648-AP08) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7065. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 110601A] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7066. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Reopening of Directed Fishery for Pacific Mackerel [Docket No. 000831250-0250-01; 032602D] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7067. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 022502C] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7068. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the IFQ Program [I.D. 021402B] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7069. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Grant Fellowships: 1) National Marine Fisheries Service—Sea Grant Joint Graduate Fellowship Program in Population Dynamics and Marine Resources Economics; and 2) Sea Grant—Industry Fellowship Program: Request for Applications for FY 2002 [Docket No. 990810211-1294-02] (RIN: 0648-ZA69) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7070. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Announcement of Funding Opportunity to Submit Proposals for the Coral Reef Ecosystem Studies (CRESES-2002) [Docket No. 001102309-2028-02; I.D. 010802D] received May 10, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7071. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications; Pacific Whiting [Docket No. 020402077-2077-1; I.D. 032502A] (RIN: 0648-AP85) received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7072. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 040102E] received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7073. A letter from the Acting Vice President for Government Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the financial performance of each of Amtrak's intercity passenger routes for the fiscal years 2001 and 2000, as calculated in accordance with Amtrak's Route Profitability System, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 548(b) and 644(1)(B); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7074. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NOAA Climate and Global Change Program, Program Announcement [Docket No. 00616180-2007-05] (RIN: 0648-ZA91) received May 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7075. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, VETS, Department of Labor,

transmitting the Department's final rule—Annual Report from Federal Contractors (RIN: 1293-AA07) received May 10, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7076. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegation of Authority [T.D. ATF-477] (RIN: 1512-AC44) received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7077. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Disaster Relief Distributions by Charities to Victims of September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attacks (Notice 2001-78) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7078. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2002-10) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7079. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of Returns and Claims for Refund, Credit, or Abatement; Determination of Correct Tax Liability (Rev. Proc. 2002-13) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7080. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Split-Dollar Life Insurance Arrangements (Notice 2002-8) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7081. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Procedures for Amending Individual Retirement Arrangements (IRAs), Simplified Employee Pensions, and SIMPLE IRA plans (Rev. Proc. 2002-10) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7082. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Amendment to Section 60501 Cross-Referencing Section 5331 of Title 31 Relating to Reporting of Certain Currency Transactions by Nonfinancial Trades or Businesses Under the Bank Secrecy Act [TD-8974] (RIN: 1545-BA48) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7083. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue Shipping and Air Transport Industries Federal Income Tax Withholding on Compensation Paid to Nonresident Alien Crew Member by a Foreign Transportation Entity [UIL 3401.01-05] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7084. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-Out Inventories (Rev. Rul. 2002-4) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7085. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Losses Reported from Inflated Basis Assets from Lease Stripping Transactions [UIL 9226.01-00] received May 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7086. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2002-25) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7087. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Industry Specialization Program Coordinated Issue Paper Industry: Maquiladora—received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7088. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Basis of Partner's Interest; Special Rules—received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7089. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Partial Relief from the Substantiation Requirements of Section 170(f)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code for Charitable Contributions Made After September 10, 2001, and Before January 1, 2002 (Notice 2002-25) received May 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7090. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Preliminary report on Animal Disease Risk Assessment, Prevention, and Control Act of 2001; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

7091. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter notifying Congress of the intent to obligate funds in accordance with Title II of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Acts, 2001 and 2002., pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2621. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to consumer product protection; with an amendment (Rept. 107-485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SPRATT (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 4830. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Southern Campaign of the Revolution Heritage Area in South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WAXMAN,

Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WU, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 4831. A bill to prohibit certain expatriated corporations from being eligible for the award of Federal contracts; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4832. A bill to require the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality to conduct studies on the comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of prescription drugs that account for high levels of expenditures or use by individuals eligible for Medicare or Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish authority for the imposition of civil penalties for direct-to-consumer advertisements that violate such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BALDACCI:

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to provide for improved public health and food safety through enhanced enforcement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 4835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the harbor maintenance tax is applied to certain ports that import cargo exceeding \$100,000,000 in value per year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish policies for any requirement by the Department of Veterans Affairs that veterans be required to split their medications as a cost-saving measure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. REYES, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 4837. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to fully implement a program which provides for dedicated commuter lanes at land points of entry into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 4838. A bill to provide that active duty members of the military be able to fully participate in Federal elections in American Samoa by providing that the office of Delegate from American Samoa to the United States House of Representatives shall be elected by a plurality of the votes cast; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GRUCCI:

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for employers who allow their employees to participate in volunteer firefighter training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure the use of sound science in the implementation of that Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 4841. A bill to establish the Hudson-Fulton-Champlain 400th Commemoration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to terminate the requirement that disability compensation payable to a veteran by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs be reduced by the amount of any payment to that veteran under Department of Defense separation programs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GANSKE, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 4843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the use of biodiesel as a fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 4844. A bill to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare demonstration project under which incentive payments are provided in certain areas in order to stabilize, maintain, or increase access to primary care services for individuals enrolled under part B of such title; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to clarify the sources of silver for bullion coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REYES (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 4847. A bill to establish the Southwest Regional Border Authority; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act relating to certain import-sensitive articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas,

Mr. FRANK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 4849. A bill to encourage the development and promulgation of voluntary consensus standards by providing relief under the antitrust laws to standards development organizations with respect to conduct engaged in for the purpose of developing voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. INSLER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of items and services provided to Medicare beneficiaries residing in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4851. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6910 South Yorktown Avenue in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "Robert Wayne Jenkins Station"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the geographic allocation of funds made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care on a basis that better reflects the veterans population of different regions of the country and that accounts for significant shifts in the veterans populations in those regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 4853. A bill to provide that land which is owned by the Seminole Tribe of Florida but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Tribe may be mortgaged, leased, or transferred by the Tribe without further approval by the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution designating an official flag of the Medal of Honor and providing for presentation of that flag to each recipient of that Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Role Models Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution supporting peace and democracy in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and an end to the plunder of its natural resources; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HOKSTRA, Mr. FORBES, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution recognizing the exploits of the officers and crew of the S.S. Henry Bacon, a United States Liberty ship that was sunk on February 23, 1945, in the waning days of World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution honoring General Bernard A. Schriever, United States Air Force (retired), for his dedication and service to the United States Air Force, for his essential service in the development of the United States ballistic missile program, and for his lifetime of work to enhance the security of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 430. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the use of content labeling for Internet web sites of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

267. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 4021 memorializing the President of the United States and the States Congress join with the state of Washington and other states in honoring the 200th Anniversary of the United States Military Academy at West Point in recognizing that the United States Military Academy is a living testament to the accomplishments of the United States throughout its history, and in recognizing West Point and its graduates as they move forward into the Academy's third century of service to the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

268. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 4017 memorializing the United States Congress to assure prompt augmentation of lead federal agencies at the borders by accepting the governors' offer of National Guard forces under state command and control pursuant to 32 U.S.C. Sec. 502(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

269. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 4025 memorializing the United States Congress through its process to reauthorize IDEA, modify the wording regarding "natural environments" to allow for parent choice for assessment and treatment of their developmentally delayed infants and toddlers at a Neurodevelopment Center such as the seventeen outstanding Neurodevelopment Centers serving children serving children and families in Washington State; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

270. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 8031 memorializing the United States Congress the Northwest congressional delegation and the Bush Administration to reauthorize REPI for an additional ten years, with such modifications as are needed to provide greater certainty of payment and, therefore, greater incentives to qualified renewable energy projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

271. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Substitute House Joint Memorial No. 4026 memorializing the United States Congress to continue its worthy endeavor to designate the former Eagledale ferry landing on Bainbridge Island as a national memorial to remember the unconstitutional interment of Japanese-Americans during World War II; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to the public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 179: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 239: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 595: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 599: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 600: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 671: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 699: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 877: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 912: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 938: Mr. BALDACCIO.
H.R. 1011: Mr. ROSS and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1037: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1092: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 1109: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1262: Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 1296: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 1324: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1387: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1433: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1541: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1556: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1596: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1598: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1609: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1613: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1642: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 1682: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1701: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 1723: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1754: Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 1908: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1962: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 1993: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 2111: Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 2117: Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 2118: Ms. McKINNEY.
H.R. 2173: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 2200: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 2219: Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 2329: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 2521: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2527: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2619: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 2621: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2637: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2649: Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SHADEGG, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2817: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2966: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2974: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3131: Mrs. JOHNSON of California.
H.R. 3132: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3193: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3206: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3250: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 3312: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3321: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3450: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3469: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3482: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 3512: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 3533: Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 3585: Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 3626: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRUCCI.

H.R. 3710: Mr. HILLEARY.
 H.R. 3713: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3726: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 3741: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 3834: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 3878: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 3884: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 3897: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 3913: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3930: Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HORN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. NEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. OSE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. HART, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 3932: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 3961: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 3992: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 4000: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 4025: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4030: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 4058: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. REYES, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4066: Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 4087: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 4152: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 4169: Mr. TRAFICANT.
 H.R. 4187: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 4481: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 4515: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 4575: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRANK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 4582: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4599: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 4605: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BARRETT.
 H.R. 4611: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SABO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 4620: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. HART, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4622: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 4642: Ms. HART.
 H.R. 4671: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 4679: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H.R. 4685: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 4701: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HORN, Mr. JEFF MILLER of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. AKIN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 4704: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 4709: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4720: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 4740: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PETRI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 4748: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4754: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 4777: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. REYES, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCOTT.
 H.R. 4778: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 4793: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 4795: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 4798: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 4812: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4813: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4814: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 4815: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4816: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4825: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. FLAKE.
 H.J. Res. 92: Mr. FILNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. NADLER.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. TRAFICANT.
 H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Con. Res. 345: Mr. LEVIN.
 H. Con. Res. 355: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. WU.
 H. Con. Res. 382: Mr. BONIOR.
 H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. NADLER.
 H. Con. Res. 401: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H. Con. Res. 403: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. BASS.
 H. Con. Res. 404: Mr. HORN, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. WATSON, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FROST.
 H. Con. Res. 406: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. HUNTER.
 H. Con. Res. 407: Mr. BARRETT and Mr. PENCE.
 H. Res. 394: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. MCKINNEY and Ms. ESHOO.
 H. Res. 416: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. BALDACCI

AMENDMENT No. 22: In chapter 14 of title I, strike section 1404 (relating to treatment of certain counties for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare program).

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 23: In chapter 12 of title I, in the item relating to "ELECTION ADMINISTRATION REFORM AND RELATED EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$200,000,000)".

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLDEN

AMENDMENT No. 24: In section 1404(a)(1)(A), strike "and Columbia Counties" and insert "Columbia, Northumberland, and Schuylkill Counties".

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to prevent employees of the Department of Justice from preparing a report to the Congress on how they review and act on memoranda that are prepared by Federal Bureau of Investigation agents in district offices and headquarters and that deal with terrorist threats.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to prevent the Department of Justice from releasing to the Congress the names of those detained pursuant to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks or providing an explanation to the Congress for not releasing such names.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to prevent the Immigration and Naturalization Service from training Border Patrol agents in avoiding racial profiling incidents at stops along the borders.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 28: Page 50, line 7, insert the following after the colon: "Provided further, That none of the funds provided under the second proviso of this paragraph shall be available for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency:".

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 29: Page 138, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3001. None of the funds made available in this Act for humanitarian and refugee assistance for the West Bank and Gaza shall be made available for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.